

The Heritage Lodge

No. 730, A.F.& A.M., G.R.C.



Instituted: September 21, 1977
Constituted: September 23, 1978

PROCEEDINGS

Vol. 12, 1988 - 1989

Worshipful Master:

R.W.BRO. Edmund V. Ralph

Editor :

R.W.Bro. Jacob (Jack) Pos

**10 Mayfield Avenue,
Guelph, Ont. N1G 2L8
(519) 821-4995**



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2013

<http://archive.org/details/heritagelodge1989free>



THE WORSHIPFUL MASTER

R.W. Bro. Edmund V. Ralph

Initiated in Ashlar Lodge No. 247	1953
Worshipful Master Ashlar Lodge No. 247 . .	1970
Toronto Lodge of Perfection	1972
Toronto Sovereign Chapter of Rose Croix .	1973
Moore Sovereign Consistory	1974
Affiliated Heritage Lodge No. 730	1977
District Deputy Grand Master Toronto 5 . .	1978
Holy Royal Arch York Chapter No. 62	1983
Allied Masonic Degrees of Canada, Richmond Hill Chapter No. 168	1987
Rameses Temple of Toronto	1987

PREFACE

Heritage Lodge has moved into its second decade and some of our original objectives still elude us. The challenge is preserving, collecting, cataloguing, displaying, interpreting and publishing our Masonic past for the future. The Lodge must pursue these activities with diligence.

The "strategic planning process" remains an essential method for the renewal and accomplishment of our objectives. The efficiency of our management is limited by the principle that only "rulers rule". The Management Committee (C.G.P.) must govern and guide the Lodge as it adapts to the changes which confront it.

The North American Lecture Tour by V.W.Bro. John Hamill P.G.J.D., was an outcome of the 'International Freemasonry' theme for this year. It is an example of how the Lodge may go beyond the traditional lodge lecture method to provide more masonic light to our members and others in this jurisdiction. The masonic displays at regular meetings and the newsletter 'CHIPS' are other examples of extending our communications.

The revision of by laws remains under the review of the Board of General Purposes. While the proposed changes break from tradition, they are essential at this stage in our development.

It is indeed a singular honour and distinguished privilege to serve and contribute to the Lodge.

Fraternally,
E.V.Ralph, W.M.

EDITORIAL COMMENTS

The Worshipful Master, R.W. Bro. E.V. Ralph, has endeavoured to bring an International flavour to our activities this year. For the first paper of these Proceedings, R.W. Bro. John Storey was persuaded to return and present another very interesting paper, dealing with the extreme hardships encountered by Freemasons in the Orient. The paper was reviewed by R.W. Bro. Christopher Haffner, S.D. of Quatuor Coronati Lodge No. 2076, D.G.M. (Hongkong & The Far East).

The Fifth Annual Heritage Banquet was again held in the Visitor's Centre, Black Creek Pioneer Village. The Guest Speaker, Jerry Marsengill, President of the Philalethes Society and Editor of the bi-monthly magazine, presented a paper titled "Anti-Masonry, A Continuing Problem".

The Regular Meeting in March was held in the Toronto Masonic Lodge Building, 888 Yonge St. W. Bro. Malcolm Montgomery presented a paper titled "Winners and Losers: The Impact of the American Revolution on Freemasons of the Mohawk Valley". The formal review of the paper was presented by R.W. Bro. Robert S. Throop. A lively discussion followed which was concluded by the author's rebuttal.

The May Meeting was held in the Masonic Building, Windsor, Ontario; with a number of visitors present from the United States and other Districts. The Special Guest on this occasion was W. Bro. J.M. Hamill, PAGDC, Librarian & Curator, United Grand Lodge of England. He spoke on the subject "Masonic Regularity - The English Point of View".

J. Pos

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
The Worshipful Master,	i
Preface,	ii
Editorial Comments,	iii
Table of Contents,	iv
Disclaimer,	iv
Freemasonry Through Adversity in the Orient, by:	
R.W. Bro. John Storey,	1
Paper Review, by:	
R.W. Bro. Christopher Haffner,	29
Anti-Masonry - A Continuing Problem, by:	
Jerry Marsengill, FPS,	35
Winners and Losers: The Impact of the American Revolution on Freemasons of the Mohawk Valley, by:	
W. Bro. Malcolm Montgomery,	46
Paper Review, by:	
R.W. Bro. Robert S. Throop,	115
Reply to Review, by:	
W. Bro. Malcolm Montgomery,	120
Masonic Regularity - The English Point of View, by:	
W. Bro. J.M. Hamill, PAGDC,	124
Appendix 'A' (Basic Principles for Grand Lodge Recognition),	137
Our Departed Brethren,	139
The Hill,	141
Lodge Officers & Committees,	142

DISCLAIMER

The contributors to these Proceedings are alone responsible for the opinions expressed and also for the accuracy of the statements made therein, and do not necessarily reflect the opinions or polocies of The Herit-
alge Lodge.

FREEMASONRY THROUGH ADVERSITY

IN THE ORIENT*

by

R.W. Bro. John Storey

My Brethren, you have heard so many talks and speeches about Freemasonry, you have read many books and articles. Through this paper, I seek your help to find answers to some pertinent questions and perhaps together we may find a lead as to where we are going.

Why has Masonry attracted men of all faiths and united them into a Brotherhood?

Why, inspite of Masonry being ruthlessly suppressed during W.W. II in Japan, Germany and occupied countries was it that our imprisoned brethren made every effort to discover each other, to meet, to maintain their Masonic knowledge by rehearsal and generally to comfort, help and sustain one another, well knowing that discovery would involve severe punishment?

Why were prisoners of war often subjected to fierce anti-masonic propaganda?

The writer of an article in Mackey's Encyclopedia on W.W. II and Freemasonry in Europe said: "Within the space of less than five years, more than 200,000 were martyred for being Masons, their properties confiscated, their families broken and they themselves tor-

* Paper presented at the Regular Meeting of The Heritage Lodge held in the Preston-Hespeler Masonic Building, Cambridge, Wednesday, September 21, 1988.

tured, imprisoned or shot."

It is apparent that where there has been and are dictatorships, oppression or military offensives, those in power have been and are afraid of, the influence of Masonry. In consequence, they have done, and in some countries today are still doing, their utmost to wipe 'it' out with every means within their power. Examples are Russia, Japan, Germany, Indo-China, Indonesia and Communist Occupied Countries.

I would like to take you for a tour through the Orient (China, Indochina and Indonesia) where even today, Masonry is prohibited. But I do have the confidence that the day will come when Masonry will return to the Light even in those countries as we ourselves strive to keep the torch burning.

BURMA

I would like to tell you of an incident which took place in Burma immediately after the Japanese surrender to the British 14th Army at Mandalay during March, 1945. Two days after the surrender, a British army officer was proceeding to the town of Maymyo about fifty miles to the north. The Welfare officer asked him to deliver a large carton of cigarettes to the Camp Commander. On his arrival, he was directed to a tent labelled 'Welfare' and found a Burmese seated at a table who explained that he was a civilian camp employee. It turned out he was an Oxford graduate and had been a Commissioner of the Rangoon Harbour Board. As he signed for the cigarettes, the Officer noticed two things. First, he had no finger nails and second, he was wearing a Masonic ring. In no time at all, they

had proven their identities and the ensuing welcome was heart-warming. The Burmese insisted that the Officer stay in his home rather than in a tent.

His story later came to light. The city of Rangoon had nine craft lodges when the Japanese were advancing on the city. He and seven other Masons, all of whom were in their fifties, set out from Rangoon, each bearing an E.C. Warrant, to walk to India, about six hundred miles away. There was no transportation. On reaching Maymyo about four hundred and fifty miles north of Rangoon, they just could not go any further so eight younger Masons from the town volunteered to complete the task of saving the warrants. However, neither they nor the warrants were ever heard of again. When the Japanese reached Maymyo, somehow or another they had heard about these eight Masons and arrested them, demanding the Masonic secrets, which were refused. All were spread-eagled on the ground, their mouths propped open and water trickled in. Gradually their stomachs became distended and it was the sentry's duty to stamp on them when he thought fit. Five victims died - the other three had bamboo slivers inserted under their finger nails and the bamboo slowly burnt. Two more died. Our Burmese brother looked up at the officer very proudly and said "They still don't know".

What would any brother in this room have done?

SOUTH EAST ASIA

The East Asia Company was responsible for the advent of Masonry in Malaya, Borneo and the Indonesian Islands. The Business men, soldiers and sailors, most of whom were in the employ of

the E.A.C. settled in these areas. In consequence, Lodges were formed and they appeared in Sumatra in 1765, Penang in 1809 and Singapore in 1845.

Apparently, attendance was a serious problem in those days. Roads were poor, transportation almost non-existent, weather conditions were bad and the calls of public service made attendance at lodge quite an undertaking. So, in order to deal with absenteeism, a system of fines was introduced. For a first offence, a fine of \$5.00 was levied. For the second offence, the fine was doubled, but for the third, the offender was liable to be expelled from the lodge.

In the early 1800's, Sir Stamford Raffles did much to forward Masonry in Malaya and Java. He was a Past Master and had received the 18th Degree.

Masonry progressed over the years but no one had foreseen that at one blow, Freemasonry in Malaya would lose practically everything: temples, furniture, warrants, jewels, records and precious documents. There was, however, something the Brethren did not lose and that was their faith and discipline of the Craft.

Immediately before the fall of Singapore, a cable was received from the D.G.L. of Transvaal advising that they had placed the sum of 300 pounds to the credit of the D.G.L. of the Eastern Archipelago for the relief of brethren from Shanghai, South China and Malaya. It is very heartening to know that we were not forgotten, however, I must comment that so little has been said or written of those in Australia and New Zealand who opened their homes to the wives and families of those men who stayed behind and who

were evacuated from the Orient. It is difficult for those of us whose friends and relatives received so much from our brethren 'down-under' to express our most heartfelt gratitude and appreciation. In my own humble way, I would like simply to say 'Thank You'.

The war was a most difficult time for every one of us who were in some way involved. I was at sea and from statistics, I understand that only one seaman in ten actually survived. And yet, we all owe so much to those who battled through against tremendous odds in prison camps. In the famous Changi Prison in Singapore, out of 3,000 internees, there were about 250 Masons. The Masons were not alone in the tremendous amount of suffering experienced, however, it is apparent quite early on that the Masons were being singled out for 'Special Treatment'. I am not going to go into detail but sufficient to say that the Japanese reactions were incalculable to the civilized mind. Their capacity for brutality was unlimited. They had been subjected to a most vicious anti-Masonic propaganda which sad to say they swallowed wholesale. For example, a Brother who was interrogated in Ipoh, North Malaya by a senior Japanese officer was accused of belonging to a society which practised child immolation or sacrifice as part of its ritual. No matter how fierce the Japanese Gestapo were in trying to stamp out Freemasonry, meetings were held in most prison camps throughout the War.

Incidentally, a small but efficient Lodge of Instruction was conducted in the open air in front of Hut No. 205 every Tuesday night. Towards the end of the internment, it was decided to hold a Convocation of the D.G.L. in order to determine a Masonic policy to be put into operation on their deliverance. Apparently, the

only place it could be held was in an ATTAP hut in the orchard in full view of the Japanese H.Q. and Guard Room. They were able to hold a memorial service for the Brethren who had passed on and a general account was given of what had taken place during internment. No doubt, discussions took place concerning the future.

In another prison immediately after the Japanese surrender, an untiled meeting was held. This was attended by about 50 brethren of many different constitutions. All were in rags and the only Masonic furniture was the V.S.L. One of those who was present wrote "But never can a meeting of Masons have been held with more fervour and heart felt thanks to the Great Architect than was this by those who may truly be termed to have been poor and distressed in a worldly sense, though rarely can have brethren been richer in spiritual uplift".

The story is told, how twenty-five 'zealous' Masons in another prison camp formed a Masonic Club despite a very stringent ban. They were able to continue to promote the tenets of Masonry during the darkest days of the P.O.W. period. They met weekly throughout their sojourn. Lectures were given and degrees practised. It is sad to relate that the majority of these brethren were called to the G.L. above while working on the Siam/Burma Railway.

Brother Wylie, P.A.D.G.M., who had been interned in Changi prison wrote the following in the short account of his experiences. "The peace and tranquillity of these meetings stood out in great contrast against the turmoil and irritation of the day. Although it was very hot, and most of the time all of us were in rags, ill, hungry, tired and dirty, yet it was possible during these meetings almost com-

pletely to forget the normal conditions of our lives as prisoners of War. To sit quietly among proven friends and listen to the ceremonies took one's thoughts very far from the prison camps and lifted the mind above the reach of petty arrogance, restored one's balance and demonstrated the possibility of victory of mind over matter, a very important factor at such a difficult time".

"Little help could come from the outside. Many died of malaria and dysentery, many were sick from beri-beri and as drugs were not available, it was important that mental strength was maintained and in that sense, a great work was done. Indeed the Craft fully justified its existence thereby and many who survived owed it to the love and caring of some Brother and without discrimination whether he was or was not a Mason." According to all reports, Brother Wylie did a tremendous lot not only for Masons but for many other internees as well.

The Badge of the re-occupying British Military Forces was the Phoenix. Freemasonry, as we have seen, did not succumb to the terrors of war and brutal occupation and its physical practice soon arose from, in some cases, quite literal ashes of its past. Indeed the first regular meeting of Lodge St. Michael took place on September 15th, 1945, only three days after the signing of the surrender. Only seven members, recently released from internment, were present. The banquet consisted of coffee and biscuits. But it was a beginning.

THAILAND

Freemasonry in Thailand did not appear until August 4th, 1910, under a Warrant from the Grand Lodge of Scotland when Lodge St. John No.

1072 (SC) came into being. Bangkok Royal Arch Chapter No. 357 (SC) received its charter the following year. Both these bodies are still active and apparently are the only permanent Masonic activity in Thailand.

Thailand was an ally of the Japanese and little is known of any Masonic activity during the war period. However, large bodies of prisoners of war moved out of Malaya and Singapore to work on the 'Death Railway' as it was called. When the railway was completed, many of the prisoners were placed in camps in Thailand in 1944. Overcrowding was so great and the Japanese objection to any meeting so pronounced that it was only possible for Masons to meet in the open air. In one camp, Taming, New Year's Day was celebrated by a meeting of over sixty Brethren. They were afterwards served rice cakes and coffee with which they drank the Loyal Toast. At Nikon Chai, another camp, on August 22nd, just after the Japanese surrender, some fifty Brethren of various constitutions met. All were in rags and the only Masonic furniture was 'The First Great Light'

PHILIPPINES

As early as 1756, two Irish Masons were tried by the Inquisition in Manila for being members of the Craft but being under the protection of the British, they were released with a reprimand.

The actual date as to when the first lodge was opened in the Philippines is not clear. It is reported to have been introduced by two Spanish Naval officers around 1850. Two lodges were formed in 1856 and 1859 with exclusive Spanish membership. Today, the Filipinos consider Lodge La Primera Luz Filipina, which was

consecrated in Cavite in 1856, as the start of Masonry in the Philippines. They celebrated their Masonic Centenary in 1956. Lodges were formed by the Germans in 1860 and by the British soon thereafter. Regrettably, increasing persecution caused these two latter lodges to dissolve. The Cavite Revolt in 1872 was blamed on a few native Masons although it was later confirmed as being led by veteran soldiers of Spanish origin who refused to accept pay reduction to make a new tribute to Spain. This was given extensive publicity as a wide-spread revolt against Spanish sovereignty and did a lot of damage to the reputation of Masonry in the Islands.

Masonry in Spain was free from persecution after 1868 and so the Spanish Masons were free to support the Masonic movement in the Philippines thereafter. A Grand Lodge was formed in 1876 and by 1879, there were nine lodges in five cities.

In 1874, 'Bro.' Admiral Malcampo, who was the founder of the first lodge returned to the Philippines as Supreme Military Commander. His first act was to eliminate all Filipinos from the lodges and dissolve all lodges under other Jurisdictions. There was alleged to be considerable intrigue in the lodges in the Philippines at that time. A German Mason was accused of being a spy and it was only with the intervention of Bismark and the German Government that the case was dismissed. Apparently, Admiral Malcampo was under considerable pressure and his actions could well have hinged upon the success of the friars in pinning the names of 'Freemasons' upon any man or group planning any liberal reforms whether involving revolution or not.

Throughout the late 1890's, problems arose between the different factions of Masons which resulted in Spain giving instructions to the Filipinos to do what they believed to be their duty: "Those who are swayed by a spirit of rebellion will find their punishment". The main trouble was that the Filipinos wanted a more democratic central body. The Filipinos were granted a Charter for a Grand Regional Council in December 1893. However, a newspaper run by the Friars in Spain sounded the alarm. "National solidarity was in danger", "The Philippines would be lost to Spain" were the headlines. The separatists were gaining ground. It is sad to relate that the period 1894 to 1897 was one in which persecution by the R.C. Church was acute and ruthless. Masons were dragged from their homes and transported to remote unhealthy regions. Even those who held professional degrees were alleged to be sympathizers of Masonry. The spate of denunciation perhaps reached its height in a published official document which said "Almost all the inhabitants of the Archipelago from the wealthiest to the poorest were Masons and that along the banks of the Pasig River alone, there were seventeen thousand native Masons". Lodge members were imprisoned in chains. A Brother, Vinciente Lukhau, defended Masonry at his trial for which he was tied elbow to elbow behind his back, lifted on a pulley and dropped from a height - the 'strap-pado' of the Spanish Inquisition. The General in command was accused of apathy as not enough people were shot. He was replaced. His successor was more prolific.

In August, 1896, a revolution broke out. This continued until 1898, when the Independence of the Philippines was declared. Masonic membership in the Government included the Head of Cabinet, Joint Secretaries of War, Secretary

of Finance, two Generals, Colonels of the Infantry, Chief of Staff and others. Masonry, although merely involved in a wish for democratic representation in Spain, in actual fact became woven into the very pattern of the Philippine Republic. Masonic leaders were the natural leaders of the new democratic regime.

However, completely independent of the wishes of the Filipino people at the end of the Spanish/American War, Spain sold the Philippine Islands to the United States for the sum of \$20,000,000.

Having a new colonial master, the Filipinos again revolted. In spite of the uprisings against the Government, lodges continued to be formed. They did have some difficulties. A meeting was being held in a Roman Catholic Chapel in Cele-celi when it had to be adjourned because the building was being riddled with bullets. Later on, American Masonic Clubs were formed and in 1907, a Regional Grand Lodge was formed. There were still restrictions against having Filipino members until a lodge under the Grand Lodge of Scotland was formed from Hong-kong, and by 1916, Lodge Perla Del Oriente No. 1034 (SC) had over two hundred members of nineteen nationalities including Russians, Cubans, Mexicans, Malays and Chinese. Incidentally, this lodge still meets on the third Saturday of every month at the Scottish Rite Temple, 1828 Taft Avenue, Manila and comes directly under the Grand Lodge of Scotland.

During W.W. II, Japan tried to eliminate Masonry completely from the Philippines. In 1945, the G.L. of the Philippines found itself sadly reduced in membership. Bro. Mauro Baradi wrote: "The end of the War found us entirely destitute. We were in dire need. Our homes were

mere heaps of ruin and some of our loved ones gone. Masonic Temples became ashes of destruction. More tragic still was that out of more than seven thousand of our order before the War, only about half of that number were accounted for thereafter". The pre-war Senior Grand Warden, Bro. Michael Goldenberg became acting Grand Master in 1945, and it was due to him that Grand Lodge resumed operation later that same year.

Of the overseas Brethren's participation in the revival, he said in 1946: "We should never forget that our prompt rehabilitation was due to the co-operation and help extended to us by our Brethren who came from across the Pacific. Scarcely had we got together in March last year and opened our small temple and office, our Brethren of the US Armed Forces came to our assistance. To them we owe the little we now possess. They spurred us with their example. They worked hand in hand with us to the extent of doing manual labour. Their ranks were no obstacle. From Generals to the last private hobnobbed with us in true fraternal spirit."

The R.C. Church was not too happy about Masonry in the Philippines and threatened that excommunication would be automatic for those joining Freemasonry. It was not until Vatican II that the situation changed. This change took place in the late sixties when an official panel of Masons met regularly with official representatives of the R.C. Church Hierarchy every two weeks for about two years.

By the end of 1975, the Philippine Craft numbered over thirteen thousand with one hundred and sixty lodges. This last includes fourteen overseas lodges in Guam, Okinawa, Japan, Saipan, the Marshal Islands, Korea and South

Vietnam. Although Masonry in the Philippines has a considerable American minority membership, it is truly indigenous.

JAPAN

Masonry is said to have been established in Japan in 1853 when the American Expeditionary forces under Commander Matthew G. Perry landed. They were soon followed by the British 20th Regiment who introduced Sphinx Lodge No. 263 (I.C.). By the end of the century a Masonic Hall was considered necessary and by 1914 they had their own building. On September 1st, 1923 the worst natural disaster on record took place. The earthquake struck. Not even the incendiary raids of 1945 or the atomic bombs on Nagasaki and Hiroshima had its equal. One hundred and forty thousand people were burnt to death. Flames over parts of Tokyo reached over three hundred feet in height; large patches of burning material was swept over five miles into the air by the uplift caused by the intense heat.

The Yokohama Masonic Hall was completely devastated. The lodges meeting therein lost everything. However, Kobe opened their homes, welcomed refugees and families from the north. They clothed, fed, housed and financed them. Donations to the Masonic Disaster Fund amounted to 181,767 Yen. The Masonic Hall was rebuilt and consecrated in 1927.

With the advent of Naziism in Europe, the influence of Germans amongst the militants in Japan prospered. From the outset, it was apparent that Masons and Masonry was the target of their oppression. Rotary clubs were dissolved as being agents of Freemasonry; Boy Scouts were also dissolved as their pledge of duty was seen through the eyes of the Militants to be the

origin of a masonic obligation.

In the light of the persecution which took place in the 1920's, Dr. Sakuzo Yoshino wrote in his book called "The Study of Freemasonry": "Freemasonry is the foundation for world peace and brotherhood. It is a matter of congratulation that the League of Nations was created with the genuine spirit of Free-masonry. No one could desire the supression of Freemasonry when he realises that the Fraternity is based on the most noble and glorious ideals of our human world. The spirit of Freemasonry is the sutelist of cultures, since the earnest zeal to seek truth, goodness and beauty in this fraternity contributes much toward the cultural cause of the world. The desire to demolish freemasonry is equal to unwillingness to wish for the development of humanity." In spite of the opposition at that time, the number of lodges increased and the total membership in five lodges was two hundred and sixty nine.

During W.W. II, Japan strictly prohibited any form of so called "secrete society". Persecution of Masons followed and of course spread to all the countries occupied by their Forces. Bros. Lachie and Stanbury of Lodge Hiogo and Osaka were arrested in Osaka. They were accused of "Economic Espionage" including the question of Freemasonry. From the line of questioning, it was apparent that the Japanese Prosecutor was influenced by Nazi advisors in the Japanese Home Office. Bro. Lachie was accused of being a Jew but persisted that he was in fact a Scottish Presbyterian. This was not acceptable. Bro. Lachie finally settled the stalemate by suggesting that a very cursory physical examination would prove that he had never been subjected to certain ritual surgery essential to those of the Jewish faith. Later,

the Prosecutor accepted the fact that Bro. Lachie was a Christian but could not understand that he could be a Christian and a Freemason at the same time. Bro. Lachie said that he could give many reasons but asked if he might short circuit the reasoning by being permitted to ask a simple question. The question was "Are you a Buddhist?". The very reluctant answer was "Yes". Bro. Lachie then said that as a high ranking government official, he would certainly also be a Shintoist, which he admitted. This concluded the questioning on Freemasonry.

In Kobe, Bro. Levy, a Frenchman, who had been the last Prin. "Z" of Rising Sun Chapter was able to purchase the Lodge Bible and some masonic books through a Japanese friend when the masonic assets were sold by the Enemy Property Custodian. The books were lost in air raids but the Bible survived and was restored to use when Masonry was revived after the War. Regrettably, Bro. Levy was goaled for three months prior to the Japanese surrender on the usual spy and Masonic charges. He was severely beaten, starved and had rather a miserable time. Bro. Michael Apcar, Past Master and Treasurer of Lodge Star in the East (SC) was arrested immediately after war broke out. He was subjected to almost continuous interrogations over a period of months and ultimately placed in solitary confinement. His total imprisonment lasted about fourteen months. During this time, he steadily fulfilled all the points of his obligation to the Craft and refused to divulge anything. His persecution was most severe.

Immediately after the "Cease Fire", craft members in the armed forces formed the "Tokyo Bay Masonic Club". Many members of the Lodge Star in the East No. 640 (SC) joined. Soon afterwards, four boxes of Masonic records were

found. These included the Charter of Lodge Star in the East and Bro. Apcar was 'Pressed' to resume labour. Other missing items were found. The magnificent clock presented by the Scottish Rite to the Temple was found in the office of the Yokohama Chief of Police. The old organ was discovered in the home of the police sergeant who had been in charge of masonic persecution. The first regular meeting of the lodge was held on April 9th, 1946. From then on, four meetings a month were held and even then they could not adequately cope with the amount of work. This was the first stage of reviving Freemasonry after the War.

As soon as Bro. Levy was released from goal, he set to work reviving his Chapter and Lodge. On September 5th, 1946, with only two other members of the lodge present and the other chairs occupied by members of other lodges, Lodge Hyogo and Osaka resumed labour with Bro. Levy in the chair. On this occasion, he addressed the Brethren: "We meet here this evening, in open lodge for the first time in four years and eleven months; so many of our Brethren have answered the final call. Our lodge has in its long years of existence seen many years of happiness, but it cannot be denied that it has had its share of sadness and adversity, particularly since the start of the Pacific War, when not only were our properties confiscated, but several Brethren were being thrown in goal on some put-up charges, but their real crime was that of being members of our Ancient and Honourable Institution. The confiscation of our records as well as our furniture and all Masonic regalia assured the authorities that they had broken the Masonic backbone. As you Brethren are well aware, the Masonic backbone consists of its excellent principles, traditions and tenets."

The Secretary of the Kobe Base Masonic Club wrote: "Masonry still lives in Japan, as it does and will live throughout the rest of the world as long as there are men who remain true to those moral teachings and the principles which have made it possible for the institution of Masonry to stand the test of time over the centuries of the past."

It was in 1950, that the Japanese nationals began to come into Masonry. An article in the Nippon Times for January 9th, 1950, carried the headline "Portals of Freemasonry is opened to Japanese. Five top Dietmen among the first to be initiated."

In 1974, a petition for the consecration of a R.A. Chapter under the Supreme Grand Chapter of England was refused as none of the petitioners had the necessary qualifications of having passed through the Chairs and dispensation could not be granted. However, the Consecration Ceremony actually did take place in Hongkong on September 19th, 1975. Senior officers represented the English District in the three Principals and members of the Scottish and Irish Constitutions took part as Officers. The majority of the petitioners came down from Japan for the consecration. In mid 1976, ten Companions travelled to Japan to exalt two Brethren and perform the first Installation in an English R.A. Chapter in Japan since the War.

KOREA

Towards the end of 1907 or early 1908, in the home of Dr. William B. Scranton in Korea, steps were taken to initiate a petition to form a lodge in Seoul. The petition was sent to Lodge Hyogo and Osaka in Japan for endorsement and forwarded to the Grand Lodge of Scotland. On

November 5th, 1908, the G.L. of S. issued the charter for the new Lodge Han Yang No. 1048 (SC). It was officially opened on May 29th, 1909 and this is, by the way, my Mother Lodge.

About one third of the founding members were miners from mines of North Korea. During 1911, there were a number of prospective members from that area but due to problems of transportation and pressures of work, they were unable to come to Seoul for the Initiation. The R.W.M. was able to obtain dispensation to convene meetings in the mining area. The dining room of the mining complex was turned into a temporary lodge room and the degrees were conferred on ten candidates. Apparently, this is the only occasion Lodge Han Yang has met outside of Seoul.

Those were difficult days. Many hardships were taken in the stride of the advancement of Masonry in Korea. In 1912, a candidate traveled eighty miles on a pony and twelve hours in a train. Also, in the 1960's, the service men came down from the DMZ, four hours in an open jeep. There were many visitors to the lodge but resident members were scarce. At times, messengers had to be sent out to bring members from sick beds so that the lodge could be opened. "We could not disappoint our visitors."

The lodge building was completely destroyed by fire in 1925. Until a new charter arrived from Scotland, the lodge was able to operate under authority of a cable from the G.L. of S. "You are hereby authorized to hold meetings with this cable as your authority". Meetings were held in quite a variety of places. The Throne Room of the Capital Building, the Auditorium of Seoul City Hall, the Ballroom of the Chosen Hotel, quonset huts of the US Army, old warehouses and others were used. The Japanese

did everything possible to compromise and close down this lodge during their occupation of Korea. However, it was in darkness from 1941 to 1945 during W.W. II and again from 1951 to 1952 during the Korean incident. During the liberating of South Korea by the Americans, the lodge was reorganized and reopened. The demand for affiliation and initiation was so great, that at one time, candidates were advised their names could not be reached for at least a year (although meetings were held weekly).

During the winter months, heating was a major problem. The brethren would be present wearing parkas etc. When I was initiated, our only heating was a small pot-bellied stove in a large hall. I just about froze, having been "divested of my garments" etc. Electric power was also a problem. Not infrequently, the lights would fade out and the Master would request the brethren on the sidelines to illuminate the room by means of their pocket torch lights. We had to improvise in those days. Aprons were pieces of white cloth with ink roundels, the altar was a wooden box with cloth over it and ordinary candlesticks were used for the lights. We had an old black and white squared carpet which was carefully laid down for the ceremony and rolled up afterwards.

Since I left Korea in early 1962, Masonry has advanced appreciably. In 1967, Sir Ronald Orr-Ewing, M.W.G.M.M. (SC) visited Korea, accompanied by his wife and Dr. Alex Buchan. In his report to Grand Lodge, he said of his Korean visit --- "We had a Masonic breakfast with the Master and brethren of Lodge Han Yang. We saw a splendid First Degree worked by the Master Bro. Leland. I was tremendously impressed by the whole ceremony including the work of the Deputy Master Bro. Rhee who is Korean." Later that

year, the M.W.G.M. of the Philippines visited Korea for the consecration of Korea's second lodge the McArthur Lodge No. 138 (P.I.). In 1973, Lodge Pusan No. 1675 and in 1979, Lodge Harry S. Trueman No. 1727 (SC) were consecrated.

INDONESIA

The Dutch colonized Indonesia about the year 1602 but from all reports, the first lodge did not appear until 1762. It was soon thereafter, that the British succeeded in isolating Java from Europe by a naval blockade and capturing the Islands. The lodges had quite a chequered existence and not much is known about them until after the Dutch regained control when two lodges survived. About 1837, they merged and the Lodge "De Loge de Star in het Oosten" was consecrated. This Lodge continued to operate until President Sukarno prohibited Masonry on February 25th, 1961.

Masonry was at its height towards the end of the 1800's. The Masons undertook much social work, promoted aid, opened banks and people's pharmacies, financed educational institutions and opened schools. Much of this work was subsequently taken over by the authorities.

When W.W. II broke out, there were about twelve hundred brethren in twenty-five lodges in twenty cities.

After the occupation of Indonesia in 1942, the Japanese took very strong measures to root out Freemasons. Apparently, they were only interested in the activities of Masons behind locked doors. They wanted to know the nature of the business conducted at Masonic meetings since there was no doubt in their minds, that

the war effort had its origin in those places. Where the Japanese got hold of these ideas is a good question. They could not get the kind of information they wanted even though our POW Masonic brethren were subjected to the cruellest of tortures, almost as though the occupying Japanese wanted to have the "Honour and Glory" of being the first to be able to get the information and evidence to send to their government head-quarters. Hence, every country's occupying forces were trying to outdo the other in the methods used. One report states that out of one-hundred and ninety-seven British internees, only sixteen survived the ordeal. Yet through it all, apparently some Masonic labour was being secretly conducted.

After the defeat of the Japanese in 1945, much hard work was undertaken to revive Freemasonry. By the time President Sukarno prohibited Freemasonry in 1961, there were nine lodges under the Grand Lodge of the Netherlands, one Scottish lodge and four Indonesian speaking lodges.

It was on February 25th, 1961, that Freemasonry, along with many other organizations in the spiritual and religious field was prohibited. This prohibition has remained in force up to the present time.

CHINA

Freemasonry made its appearance through Canton in the mid 1700's, almost a century before it came to Hongkong. Lodges were formed and Masons came from the business men, sailors and soldiers who were sojourned there. Freemasonry was then, as it is today, a uniting force. However, activity in the Canton area came to a close with the movement of trade to

Macao and the opening up of Hongkong. This, no doubt, was due to there being little or no local support especially when contact between the Chinese and foreigners was so restricted.

The next reference to Masonry in China was in 1860, when Lodge Royal Sussex was revived in Shanghai. Masonry developed, lodges were consecrated and a new Masonic Temple was built.

It is interesting to note that the foundation stone of the new Holy Trinity Cathedral was laid with full Masonic honours on March 24th, 1866, in Shanghai. Records reveal that lodges were formed and consecrated in a number of cities in China, including Shanghai, Tientsin, Chungking, Fouchow, Amoy, Canton and Ningpo. All four constitutions, English, Scottish, Irish and Philippines, were active. From 1925, the relationship between China and Japan steadily deteriorated. I am not going to go into the details of what happened during that period, but Japan's aspirations and their conquest of Manchuria ultimately lead to the outbreak of War in 1937, when Japanese forces invaded China. As I was there at that particular time, I must say that things were pretty grim. This situation severely restricted Masonic activities and curfews and travel restrictions made life a bit difficult. To quote a report on the takeover of Nanking, the Chinese Capital in 1937:- "The Japanese soldiers were brutal, driven by overbearing officers and frustrated by lack of supplies. The behaviour of the troops when they took over Nanking in December 1937, exceeded all other episodes of cruelty meted out by the Japanese." In March, 1938, the Far Cathay Lodge No. 2855 was working a Third Degree when an exceptionally heavy air raid took place. Notwithstanding the bombing and anti-aircraft fire, they completed the cere-

mony. Later, the Chinese started extensive demolition of the building and huge fires were burning in various parts of the city. Part of the Masonic Temple became the H.Q. for the Special Japanese Police. In 1939, troubles with the authorities continued with dislocation of trade and reduction of supplies. And, as if these troubles were not enough, nature added the disaster of the great flood in Tientsin, when there was seven to eight feet of water in the street outside the Temple and four to five feet inside. However, meetings continued in spite of the flood.

The Japanese occupation of China and later the so called Liberation by the Communists, resulted in a steady withdrawal of Europeans from China. Most went on leave expecting to return but were never granted a re-entry permit. Local membership was limited and pressure from the authorities acute. So gradually, one lodge after another was obliged to go into darkness. The last Lodge to close was Cosmopolitan Lodge No. 428 (SC) which closed in 1962 and moved to Hongkong where it is still active today. In fact, I happen to be a life member of that Lodge. To our knowledge, there has been no Masonic activities in China since that date.

HONGKONG

Freemasonry in Hongkong is very active. I am not going to go into detail of what our brethren went through during the War as this would only be repeating what took place in the other areas I have already covered. In Fact, it could be the subject of another paper. A number of lodges from China were revived in Hongkong and are now in operation quite successfully.

Masonry in Hongkong and China*

During the Pacific War, masonic activity in Hongkong officially ceased. Nevertheless, several lodges held meetings in the internment camp once a year to prevent any possibility of being declared dormant.

Brethren in the unoccupied part of China revived Lodge Star of Southern China in Chungking. A Philippine lodge in Chengtu met uninterruptedly, whilst the small English lodge in Foochow continued meeting until 1944.

Revival in Hongkong after the war was quite rapid and by 1946 almost all the pre-war lodges and higher degree bodies were working again.

Masonry in China finally closed down in 1962, after thirteen years of Communist rule. Today, Hongkong has twenty craft lodges, nine Royal Arch Chapters, four Mark lodges, two K.T. Preceptories, and three bodies under the A. & A. Rite and several other bodies working under charters from England, Ireland and Scotland.

However, Hongkong has only eleven years to run before its administration is taken over by China. What will happen to Freemasonry ??? Of course, no formal assurances have been given, but the promises or omens appear to be good. China seems to be less anxious to change the nature of Hongkong than her own aspiring democratic politicians. The local Director of the New China New Agency has given his assurance

* This is an extract from a paper given by the D.G.M. of Hongkong and the Far East, R.W. Bro. Chris Haffner on the subject of 'Freemasonry in Hongkong' -- Charter-Cosmo Transactions, Vol.8 for 1986, which has just been published.

that Masonry will be welcome to continue. We can take some reassurance from the survival of Lodge Cosmopolitan under thirteen years of communist rule at a much less promising time in China's history.

Perhaps our greatest problem lies within our own lodges. We masons are essentially conservative in outlook, being rooted in traditions of the past. We have to think radically in the short period left to us, yet all too often we are advised to do nothing. Some brethren have suggested that the survival of our lodges can only be assured by transferring them outside of Hongkong. This, however, is not why our Masonic forebears founded the lodges of Hongkong, whose continuing fellowship we enjoy so much.

We have eleven critical years left to us. Within these, will we have taken the right steps with regard to explaining our basic principles and ritual in Chinese? Should we be thinking of a Grand Lodge of Hongkong or will survival depend on maintaining overseas ties? Above all, will we be able to ensure that enough initiates come forward who will remain in Hongkong after 1997???

INDONESIA

A souvenir in the Brisbane Masonic Museum is the famous apron of the "Ming" branch at Padang, Indonesia. It is made of calico, bordered with blue material and the tassels cut from a bully-beef tin. The last time this was worn was on "Victory in the Pacific" Day, August 22nd, 1945, during a special thanksgiving service in memory of fallen brethren. Ming (Masonic Instruction New Guinea) which had meant so much

to so many men was typed for the last time on August 2nd, 1948. The following poem, anonymously printed in a booklet about Ming needs no explanation:-

Here in this place has stayed,
And here always has gleamed the Light:
Here Masons met and worked and prayed
When all the North was darkest night.

How many brethren laboured on
Through blood and wounds and mortal pain
Dispelling night and now have gone
to live in Light, and with God remain.

Their memory here we consecrate
The work they started shall not cease.
The Flaming Sword shall not abate
Until is won enduring peace.

When War is done, Peace shall not be
Just as follows night and day;
Peace is work for Masonry
Such are the words we hear them say.

The Mason's grip has been exchanged
Here by men of every clime
Beneath one symbol are we ranged
Of one above the strifes of time.

May those who too far from home return
Bear the message deep in the heart;
To toil for Peace and deeply learn
And teach our strong Pacific art.

To keep the Working Tools in use;
As keenly bright the Sword at rest;
Aspire by Plumb, by Level choose
In all, apply the Square as test.

New Guinea Lodge; We saw your Light

Against the rolling evil dark;
Inspired by the kindly sight
We passed and leave this Mason's Mark.

Can we say this of Heritage Lodge?

My Brethren; those of you who have suffered adversity and know something of the wars we have been through can only appreciate perhaps more than ever before, that we did take the step and requested to be admitted to the Craft. At the time, we knew little or nothing of its history or what men had suffered so that we could enjoy the Freedom we have today. It is without a doubt that Freemasonry is a force to be reckoned with, a Uniting Force, a force which unites men of all races, colours and creeds for good. Perhaps, that is what the Japanese Militants, the Communists and the Spanish Inquisition were afraid of and so have done their utmost to eliminate it in the past.

This makes our own individual and personal responsibility so much the greater. In the foregoing paper, I have tried to reveal to you some of the evidence of Freemasonry in action and perhaps some answers to my questions at the beginning of this paper. Don't you think, that it is for you and me now to let the Almighty use this tremendous Force for Good which is within every one of us and so together seek and find the answers to the major problems of our times in our homes, our workplace and our communities.

My Brethren, I am firmly convinced that the Almighty has a Plan and that You have a PART.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Craft in the East (Haffner, 1977).
The Pentagram Vol. XLIII (1958), War and Recovery.
District Grand Lodge of Far East Proceedings 1970/71, Masonry in Korea.
District Grand Lodge of Far East Proceedings 1972/73, Masonry in Japan.
Quator Coronati Transactions Vol. LXXVII (1964), Craftsmen in Captivity.
Chater/Cosmo Transactions Vol. 1 for 1979, Japanese Occupation of Shanghai.
Chater/Cosmo Transactions Vol. 2 for 1980, Fidelity in Burma, Poem, the last Unknown.
Chater/Cosmo Transactions Vol. 3 for 1981, Filipino Masonry.
Chater/Cosmo Transactions Vol. 4 for 1982, WeiHaiWei, Port and Lodges.
Chater/Cosmo Transactions Vol. 5 for 1983, History of Lodge Star, Masonry in the Far East.
Chater/Cosmo Transactions Vol. 8 for 1986.
Grand Lodge of Ireland, Annual Report, 1984, Masonry in Hongkong and the Far East.
Grand Lodge of Scotland, Year Book 1985, Lodges.

* * *

R.W.Bro. John Storey, P.M., Hon. DGW (SC)

*REVIEW OF A PAPER PRESENTED TO
THE HERITAGE LODGE*

September 21, 1988

by

R. W. Bro. John Storey

entitled

"FREEMASONRY THROUGH ADVERSITY IN THE ORIENT"

This review was prepared by R.W. Bro. Christopher Haffner, District Grand Master under the English Constitution for Hongkong and the Far East. In 1977, Bro. Haffner wrote a book called **THE CRAFT IN THE EAST**, which immediately won him recognition as an authority on the history of Freemasonry in this region. We are fortunate that, even though he cannot be present in person, he has consented to review the paper and submit his comments for discussion at this meeting.

Worshipful Master and Brethren:

Brother John Storey is well remembered in Hong Kong for his contribution to Scottish Masonry in particular. He has written a number of papers and articles on both Masonry in the Far East and the connection of the Craft with seafaring, and they have always been well received. John's sincerity and enthusiasm are contagious. Long may he continue to be infectious!

A lodge of "Research" may be said to have perhaps three different functions. In the final analysis, we ought to be concerned with origi-

nal research, delving into old hand-written records to produce something which adds to our total knowledge of Freemasonry and its relationship with the community of which it is a part. Then comes the assembly of disparate information into a cohesive whole which represents a new outlook on our history and evolution. And thirdly, we have papers which seek to educate other younger Masons, perhaps in a more easily digestible format than the books from which the information was gathered.

Bro. Storey's paper seems to fall largely into the second category; he has taken a theme --- that in the Orient Masonry has been particularly beset by adversity --- and collected together a large number of short stories which support this. Before presenting this material, He poses a series of questions right at the beginning, all asking why men were prepared to undergo this tribulation for the sake of Masonry. However in a sense, the paper is incomplete, in-so-far as this question is never answered. Instead, by way of conclusion, he confronts us with a challenge: namely, that each of us should put more effort into our Masonry, so that its potential can be utilized.

This kind of inspirational message is perhaps more appropriate for an after-dinner speech or a Grand Master's address than for a "research" paper. In any case, in this day and age, when Freemasonry is beset by critics who accuse the Craft of being a religion or a substitute for religion, I wonder if perhaps the conclusion may not be a little too idealistic? If Freemasonry is really a "supporter" or "handmaid" of religion, as the United Grand Lodge of England claims, is Bro. Storey's challenge appropriate? He speaks of "tremendous force for good which is within each one of us".

But is this force really Freemasonry, or is it not perhaps more correctly something like the "inner light" of the Quakers, or the "kingdom of God" of the teaching of Christ, which a Mason can only find if he also plays a part in his church, synagogue, or mosque?

Now I shall deal with a few matters of detail in Bro. Storey's paper.

He speaks of the "establishment" of Masonry in Japan under Perry. The only evidence for this is the account given by some Japanese who visited his flagship, and they of course had never been near a lodge room. Their words seem to describe a room on the U.S.S. **Susquehanna** as it was prepared for a lodge meeting. The original account cannot be produced now by the Grand Lodge of Japan, and Peck's **Masonry in Japan** gives the briefest of references. My conclusion is that the ship's chart-room was probably being described. In any case, to describe a possible shipboard meeting as "establishing" Masonry in Japan is hardly justified.

The advent of Masonry to Japan was indeed through Sphinx Lodge, which worked under the authority of a travelling military warrant; the civilians whom it initiated then formed Yokohama Lodge, the real basis of Masonry in Japan. The Brethren in Kobe also had a Masonic Hall, which was not destroyed. The quotation from Dr. Sazuko Yoshiro is fine, but should it not perhaps be qualified by a comment that he is massively overstating the case for Freemasonry? The membership of the "five lodges" in Japan should be qualified by adding "in the English District of Japan," because there were two Scottish lodges as well.

The story of Masonry in Japan might be con-

cluded by adding two items. First, the recent revival of Kobe Royal Arch Chapter, No. 229 under the Scottish Constitution; and second, the holding of a number of meetings of Rising Sun Lodge, No. 1401 under the English Constitution, in Tokyo, because so many of its members have been transferred to the capital by their business firms, on account of the high cost of maintaining branch offices in Osaka and Kobe.

In the story of Korea, I think it a pity to miss the tale of the Lodge Hanyang holding a meeting in Washington, D.C., by dispensation from Scotland, thus involving three continents in one meeting.

Moving on to the Philippines, I do not understand what Bro. Storey means by "A Grand Lodge was formed in 1876 and by 1879 there were nine lodges in five cities." Is he speaking of Spain first, and then of the Philippines? Or is he referring to Lodge Nilad which, as the "senior Lodge" in the Philippines, was allowed certain controlling powers over the other lodges by the Grand Orient of Spain? Certainly the Grand Lodge of the Philippines did not exist until 1912, and it celebrated its seventy-fifth anniversary with gusto last year.

In the paragraph about the 1890's, I think that two "revolutions" have been mixed up. The Masonic revolution was a desire for greater regional autonomy and less autocratic control from Spain by way of Lodge Nilad. The second revolution was the national aspiration of the Filipino people for a degree of self-government, which some felt meant greater representation in the Spanish government, whilst others sought independence. I think also that Bro. Storey should point out that the Masons were largely in the first group, but that some, no-

tably General Aguinaldo, formed a quasi-Masonic fighting force called the Katipunan, which is probably what the seventeen thousand Masons "along the banks of the Pasig River" actually were.

One last point concerning Freemasonry in the Philippines: The reference to the meeting in the Roman Catholic Chapel at Culiculi is misleading, as it was held not by Filipinos, but by a military lodge from North Dakota. The native Filipino Masonry, largely under Spanish control, and the new American Masonry developed side by side, for the most part independent of each other; the so-called "restriction" against having Filipino members was simply the chauvinistic or discriminatory use of the ballot box by the three California lodges.

Bro. Storey says that not much is known about early Masonry in Indonesia (formerly known as the Dutch East Indies). Actually there is a source that might have been consulted. I suggest that one might want to refer to Paul van der Veur's **FREEMASONRY IN INDONESIA FROM RADERMACHER TO SOEKANTO** (published in Athens, Ohio, by Ohio University Press).

I thought that the letters MING meant simply "Masons In New Guinea", M-I-N-G. I would be grateful if Bro. Storey could provide confirmation for the version he offers, which is different. Many such clubs existed, e.g., AMBING, "American Masonic Brothers In New Guinea"; HONG, "Hirams On New Guinea".

I would be interested to have more details supporting the statement that "Sir Stamford Raffles did much to forward Masonry". I had believed that he was initiated, passed and raised in Batavia (the city now known as

Jakarta), given the Eighteenth Degree up-country in Java, and then more or less did nothing further. I did not know that he was a Past Master. I have an intention --- secret until now -- - of doing a paper on Raffles some day, and any information about his Masonic activities would be gratefully received and faithfully applied.

In his section on China, Bro. Storey says that "all four constitutions were active". His list omits Massachusetts, which had many lodges there; and as well there was lesser activity by the Grand Lodge of Vienna, the Three Globes of Berlin, the Grand East of the Netherlands, the Grand Orient of France and Italy, and eventually the Grand Lodges of California, Hamburg, and China. In fact, China had lodges from practically every jurisdiction except Canada!

I will conclude these comments on a paper which I have enjoyed reading by referring to Hong Kong after 1997, when the colony becomes a part of the Republic of China. The Brethren may be interested to know that yesterday as I write (that is, on June 17, 1988) five Brethren representing the English, Irish and Scottish Craft Districts, and the English Mark District, went for a meeting with the Basic Law Consultative Committee, at which we presented our request for continuation of Freemasonry after 1997, and received positive assurance from Mr. Lu Ping, the Secretary General, that our private meetings would present no problem, since we are non-political and pledge allegiance to the law.

ANTIMASONRY - A CONTINUING PROBLEM*

by

Jerry Marsengill, FPS

President of The Philalethes Society

Twenty-one years after the founding of the first Grand Lodge, the first papal bull condemning Freemasonry was issued. Approximately 110 years from the founding of that Grand Lodge the Anti-Masonic excitement began in the United States. Anti-Masonry is not new nor has a time ever existed when some particular organization was not working against the Masonic fraternity.

The past thirteen years have seen an upsurge in anti-Masonic literature and in anti-Masonic feelings throughout the world. The current anti-Masonry drive appears to have began in England in 1976 when Stephen Knight published his Jack the Ripper: The Final Solution. This highly imaginative book was based on the theory that Eddy, Duke of Clarence, the oldest son of the Prince of Wales, later Edward VII, has contracted a secret marriage to a Roman Catholic. The alleged wife lived in Whitechapel, a sector of the London slums. According to Knight, Clarence had a daughter who would have been third in line to the throne. Again, and according only to Knight, the times were politically unstable and at times quite republican.

He makes the point, obvious only to him, that were this scandal to become known and the birth of the child were public knowledge, this

*Paper presented at the Fifth Annual Heritage Banquet of The Heritage Lodge, held in the Visitor's Centre, Black Creek Pioneer Village, Toronto, January 30th, 1989.

would furnish fuel for the smouldering embers of revolution. Knight states that the murders were intended to get rid of all the witnesses to this supposed marriage.

Knight tries to prove that all of the Jack The Ripper murders were done according to Masonic ritual. Knight, of course, knew absolutely nothing about Masonic ritual or Masonic penalties. However, with the number of gullible people in the world who will believe anything they see in print, a large number of people became opposed to the craft.

This imaginative, scandalous book became the basis for a new Sherlock Holmes movie, Murder by Degree. This movie, starring Christopher Plummer and James Mason, presented a Sherlock Holmes which none of us Conan Doyle fans would have recognized were it not billed as Sherlock Holmes. Gone was the rational, incisive, cold, thinking machine. Holmes acted more like a reporter for some paper which is sold in supermarkets.

Knight made up most of his Masonic penalties. Certainly no Freemason could ever have recognized them. The movie's producers did no better research. Sherlock Holmes shows up at the end of this deathless epic with a sheaf of papers which he fishes from his topcoat supposedly showing that the Masons were totally responsible for the murders.

This book was not enough for Knight. He followed it with another epic piece of literature The Brotherhood which expanded his attack on Freemasonry greatly. He stated that, in England Freemasons have corrupted law enforcement agencies, the court system, employment practices and even peoples' social life.

Following these wondrous "revelations" many of the church denominations issued attacks on Freemasonry. Certainly the Church of England and the English Methodist Church got on the bandwagon. The Church of England stated "Aspects of Masonic ritual condemned as blasphemous." They further declared that Freemasonry and Christianity are incompatible. This is something which William J. Whalen of Purdue University in Indiana has been stating for many years. With all due respect to the Church of England, Whalen has done a much better job with his attacks. He attacks the Masonic fraternity from the heights of knowledge and study. Professor Whalen knows far more about the fraternity than does the average Grand Master and he carefully thinks out and formulates his attacks.

The new Lutheran Church in the United States and some other countries has forbidden its ministers to be members of the Masonic fraternity. It has barely stopped short of requiring all of its members to relinquish their Masonic membership. Make no mistake about it, my brethren, Freemasonry is being attacked on all fronts.

Even Scotland Yard, that bastion of Freemasonry, has made it apparent that Masonic membership would no longer be looked on in a favourable manner. The London Observer has alleged that Freemasonry has given the English Police and many of the English criminal class a common bond. If some of the supposed facts in a number of its articles have any basis in truth, the police and the criminals in Great Britain share a common bond and the police are protective of the criminals. Like George Gershwin has that great philosopher "Sportin' Life" state in Porgy and Bess, "It ain't necessarily so." I would suggest that, rather than protecting a

brother caught in the commission of a crime, the British police, like those of Canada and America would deal more harshly with him than with any other criminal.

One of the latest problems which the fraternity faces is the actions of the televangelists who are having problems in keeping approval ratings high with their flocks. Some of these have made particular problems for the fraternity with their programs which threaten to "expose" Freemasonry. John Ankenberg, from Tennessee, has produced a number of programs which are intended to provide viewers with a candid look at Freemasonry and which in his opinion, show that Freemasonry is not compatible with Christianity. He has produced programs showing the three degrees of Craft Masonry and has also shown the Masonic funeral rites and other public ceremonies.

Unfortunately, he has had a number of fundamentalist theologians on his program who are well acquainted with the Masonic degrees and who are able to debate the subject and, since they have control of the microphones and the editing of the program, are able to present their viewpoint from an advantage. The only man to appear on Ankenbury's program to endeavour to counter his claims, was one who claimed to be a "32° Mason" from Montana. The man would have been more help to the fraternity had he remained in Montana. He was ill prepared, knew little of Masonic history, less of philosophy and provided a convenient scapegoat for any sins which the host of the program tried to heap on the collective heads of Freemasonry.

One thing about these programs. They were well written, well produced, and showed the degrees of Freemasonry accurately. Now I know

that many of our Grand Lodges and many of our Grand Officers state that we should say that these people allege that they are exposing Masonic degrees. When I can walk into any public library in the United States and find the entire ritual written out, when I can walk into most Waldenbook stores and buy a plain English copy of the Masonic ritual, it is a little foolish to keep using the worn-out word "alleged."

Most of these fundamentalists have a distaste for the fraternity which goes beyond the usual anti-Masonic feeling. Numbers of them will not allow Masons to attend their churches, nor will they allow visitors to these churches to wear any Masonic jewelry or emblems.

I was attending a church in Des Moines and was stopped at the door by one of the ushers and informed that if I wished to come into the building, I would have to remove the Masonic pin from my lapel. Since I was attending a funeral of a close friend, I complied with their wishes.

I had a Masonic funeral requested for Resthaven Cemetery in West Des Moines. The family stated that they wanted graveside services only. Consequently, the Masons gathered at the cemetery to perform the Masonic rites shortly after the funeral service at the church. The hearse pulled up, the undertaker got out and ran over to where I was standing. He asked me if I minded performing the entire committal. When I asked why he stated that the minister of First Federated Church had refused to come to the cemetery. He, the minister, stated that if "the damned Masons were going to be a part of the funeral, they could do it without me." I asked the funeral director when the preacher had told them this and he informed that it was after the

coffin had been loaded. Now, I don't particularly care what this preacher intended to do to me but it is hard to imagine any man of God acting like this to members of his congregation.

On another occasion a lady called me and requested that I do the Masonic rites for her deceased husband. I confirmed that I would and that we would get together later that day to see just exactly what she wanted. Thirty minutes later she called back and said: "Jerry, I'm sorry, but you can't do the Masonic funeral for Gene." I told her that would be fine and she asked; "Do you want to know why?" I told her if she wanted to tell me why, I would be interested. This same minister, Tom Allen of First Federated Church in Des Moines had told the family that if they had Masonic funeral services for the husband he would not allow them to have a funeral service in the church and that the rest of the family might as well not attend any more since he didn't want people like that in his church. It is hard to imagine a minister with that little consideration for other's feelings.

James Shaw from Texas, who claims to be a former 33° Mason writes a number of anti-Masonic, fundamentalist, Christ centered tracts which attempt to prove that all Freemasons, those anti-Christ people who associate with Jews and Moslems and Hindus are going to the Christian hell to burn forever. These tracts also state that no Jew and no man of any other religion has any chance to be "saved." Having worked with a number of people of other races and religions on various Masonic projects and Masonic charities and seen how superior they are to people like this, I can only sincerely hope that Dante's "ninth circle of Hell" is reserved for the like of the Reverend Mr. Shaw and those like him.

For a number of years my lodge did Masonic funerals for members of St. John's Lutheran Church. The Reverend Jerry Schmalenberger, Pastor of the church, would always walk out before the Masonic service began. Not only did he walk out, he made a production of it. His associate pastor would get the members of the Masonic group together and make a number of snide remarks about lodges and irreligious men. Most of the members of St. John's Church were members of Capital Lodge No. 110. I don't know how the others felt but I felt a childish sense of satisfaction when this associate pastor was picked up by the vice squad for molesting young boys in his confirmation class.

I have attended a number of Masonic funerals where the minister would state "Now, we will have the Christian Service." He then goes into a tirade about how the deceased was such a good Christian and how he received salvation on his deathbed. He usually ends by exhorting all present to join his particular church and bribes the congregation with the promise that they, too, will be "saved." The Masonic funeral, which emphasises that all good men are brothers is left in the position of endeavouring to refute the minister's allegations that no salvation exists outside his church.

Of course, even with the problems we have with the churches, anti-Masonry exists in many other forms. When I was in Virginia a few months ago, I asked a retired General of the Army who was a member of a Virginia lodge, why flag officers, Colonels and above, did not belong to the fraternity as they did at the time I joined. He informed me that, since 1964, it was dangerous to belong to the Masonic order. He stated that, since most of these flag rank officers had minority races, especially black men as

subordinate officers, it was impossible for them to belong to a fraternity which has a reputation for a racist stand. Now I know that most of these problems exist only in the United States because of our long struggle with the question of slavery but they do exist. We have more Freemasons in the United States than in any other country including England and our problems become the problems of a major part of the fraternity. We also have noticed that a very few of our Senators, our congressmen and other public servants still belong to the Masonic order. There was a time when all candidates for public office belonged to a number of fraternities, Elks, Oddfellows, Knights of Pythias, Eagles and Masons would list these on their resumes when they ran for election or re-election. Times have changed. We haven't had a President who was a Master Mason since Harry Truman left office in 1952. Robert Dole was the only candidate in our primary who was a member of the fraternity and he did not make mention of his membership.

Most of our politicians are running scared. They try to keep their Masonic membership quiet. When a political figure defends the fraternity such as Judge Santelle did in Virginia, we treat it as if it were a rare exercise of courage. We overlook the fact that, twenty-five years ago, a Mason would have been expected to defend the fraternity and he would have been considered a coward had he not done so. The prestige of being a Freemason is, to a great extent, gone and the little prestige which remains is rapidly being eroded.

One of my friends applied for a new job and, in the Vita which he sent to his prospective employer, he listed under organizations to which he belonged, the Masonic fraternity. He

also mentioned that he was a Past Master of a Masonic lodge. His prospective employer returned the Vita to him with the recommendation that he expunge all references to Freemasonry from his resume. He was told that, if he intended to get a different job, making a claim that he was a Freemason would work against, rather than for, him. He rewrote the Vita and was immediately accepted. Before he went to work for the company, he was also told that he shouldn't wear any Masonic jewelry around the office and that he would be well advised not to mention the Masonic order to any of his co-workers.

Before I make you think that anti-Masonry is strictly a problem in the United States, let me state that, even though the Royal Family in Great Britain has always been staunch supporters and protectors of Freemasonry, the present Queen does not look on the order favourably.

Prince Philip belongs to a lodge but has not advanced further than the Entered Apprentice degree. The Prince of Wales, who should probably be the Grand Master, has evinced no interest in the fraternity. This from a country where the Prince of Wales has been Grand Master of Masons, where Royal patronage was commonly accepted by the craft, and where Freemasons were usually honoured.

What are we doing to counteract these problems? Very little. When a religious group comes out with the bold statement that Freemasonry is, in fact, a deistic, non-Christian religion and is thereby incompatible with religion, the Masons charged to defend the order make the statement; "George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, James Otis, Conan Doyle, Rudyard Kipling and many others were Masons. Would men like this have belonged to the fraternity

if they had thought it was not a good thing?" They don't answer the criticism. They don't know how. To counteract the bad feeling fostered by religious groups they issue insipid, inane explanations of what Freemasonry really is. They try to take a balanced, rational approach with people who have their minds made up. People whose intention is to destroy the fraternity by any means which they can find and who probably know more about what Freemasonry really is than do most of the Grand Masters who issue these pamphlets. When someone is beating you about the head and shoulders with a club, a rational approach is not going to make him stop. We cannot reason with the anti-Masons. They are not reasonable people. When a number of our Grand Lodges removed the penalties from the ritual, the anti-Masons paid absolutely no attention. The penalties were only one item. When we are accused of secrecy and have open houses to show people our temples, the anti-Masons and their followers do not attend. Giving in to the demands of our critics merely gives them the opportunity to make further demands. We should never attempt to explain ourselves. If Freemasonry was good during the latter part of the past century when criticism of any "secret order" was rampant, it should be good at this time.

If Freemasonry has problems we should solve them. But any solution of our problems should address these problems from the standpoint of the fraternity. We should never let outside criticism influence us. If we need to put our house in order we should definitely do it. But to bow to our critics and try to make our fraternity conform to their wishes only opens the door to the total dissolution of our fraternity.

Those who are the most vehement in criticizing the Masonic order have only one thought in mind, the complete destruction of the fraternity. If they are able to get the Masons, themselves, to help them, they will have won a great victory. If the fraternity has problems, let us solve them. If the order is good, let us live according to its precepts. If it is bad, as our critics claim, let us leave it. Never let us change the fundamental laws, customs and traditions of our noble craft because of outside criticism. He who tries to please everyone ends to pleasing no one. Regardless of what some critic may say, let us live according to the Masonic principles which we have learned and stand fast by living in accordance with the many virtues of the order.

Jerry Marsengill.

WINNERS AND LOSERS: THE IMPACT OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION ON FREEMASONS OF THE MOHAWK VALLEY*

by

W. Bro. Malcolm Montgomery

Professor William H. Nelson in his perceptive book The American Tory (1)** observed that "The Loyalists in the American Revolution suffered a most abject kind of political failure, losing not only their argument, their war, and their place in American society, but even their proper place in history". Professor Bernard Bailyn of Harvard was more succinct and described the Loyalists as "Losers". (2) While there would seem to be little argument with Professor Nelson's conclusion as far as it goes, Bailyn's assumption that those Americans who supported the British cause in the American Revolution were total losers is subject to historical question. Further, the conclusion begs the questions as to whether those who supported the cause of revolution were the absolute winners, economically, politically and socially, and those who were freemasons in both groups fraternally winners and losers as well, within the Craft.

The famous British historian, Hugh Trevor-Roper, once noted that "All historical developments, including religious developments, are meaningless except in their social frame-

* Paper presented at the Regular Meeting of The Heritage Lodge held in the Masonic Building, 888 Yonge St., Toronto, Wednesday evening, March 15th, 1989.

** Bracketed numbers refer to the numbered references at the end of this paper.

work." (3) It would therefore seem appropriate that the questions raised above can be answered in a modest way by turning our attention to the members of a Masonic Lodge, namely St. Patrick's Lodge, No. 4, G.L.N.Y. which was warranted in 1766 and continues to this day at Johnstown, New York. The first valuable contribution to the subject of Masonic Loyalists was in a paper entitled "Loyalist Masons of the Mohawk Valley" delivered in 1963 (4) by the historian of St. Patrick's Lodge, Bro. E.F. Dougherty. This paper was slightly expanded in a book published in 1966, St. Patrick's Lodge No.4, F & A.M. 200th Anniversary, Johnstown, N.Y. 1766-1966. (5) Unfortunately Bro. Dougherty was left unnamed, but this writer is assured by W.Bro. Harold W. Nethaway of St. Patrick's Lodge, that it was prepared by Bro. E.F. Dougherty. The material is so similar in both works that it is unmistakably the writing of the same author. While Br. Dougherty did not address the questions raised in this paper, he laid a valuable foundation for future researchers upon which to explore one of the most fascinating eras in American, Canadian and British history.

Firstly, we must turn our attention to the original source material available to us. The remaining original minutes of St. Patrick's Lodge are invaluable and have been made available to this writer by the Worshipful Master and brothers of the Lodge. The original colonial minutes commence on September 8, 1766 and end 5th May, 1774. The next recorded meeting is Saturday evening, July 30th, 1785. Bro. Dougherty concluded that the last pre-Revolutionary meeting was held on Thursday 5 May, 1774. (6) Bro. Dougherty likely came to this conclusion because the colonial minutes in existence end on that date. However, non-existence of minutes really proves nothing. The colonial minutes

which are still preserved were bound in Jersey City, New Jersey in 1916. They are not contained in their original binding if, in fact, they were originally bound. Indeed, the minutes of the meeting of Thursday 5 May, 1774 give no indication whatsoever of any intention that the meetings of the Lodge were to be suspended. Rather, these minutes indicate a contrary intention, namely "Voted that the Sect'y be desired to Summon the Absent Members to attend the Lodge on the first Thursday in June next that the Quarterages and other Accounts be then Settled. Lodge closed until then". The purported last meeting even appointed a Tyler, after Bro. Thomas Morgan had previously expressed his desire to hold that office.

Another factor which throws doubt on the fact that the activities of colonial St. Patrick's Lodge ended on 5 May, 1774 is the omission from the Minutes of the funeral service of Sir William Johnson, who died on July 11, 1774 and was buried on July 13, 1774. (7) Inasmuch as nearly two thousand people were at his funeral, including Goldsbrow Banyar, the Grand Junior Warden of the Province of New York, and William Franklin, the Governor of New Jersey and a former Grand Secretary of Pennsylvania, (8) it would seem highly improbable that a Masonic service or Masonic participation would not have occurred, especially since the funerals of all the members of St. Patrick's Lodge had involved Masonic participation with the appropriate minutes recorded in the records of the Lodge. Nevertheless, no mention is made in the Lodge Minutes which leads us to doubt that 5 May, 1774 was the last pre-revolutionary meeting of St. Patrick's Lodge. Sir John Johnson, Sir William's son, who was also Provincial Grand Master of New York, was present. Col. Guy Johnson, the Master of St. Patrick's and son-in-law of

Sir William, attended, as did Col. Daniel Claus, the Senior Warden and son-in-law of Sir William, together with many other well-known Masonic personages.

As early as 1772, there grew up in the American colonies, Committees of Correspondence which were parts of the revolutionary machinery to facilitate the spread of propaganda and coordinate the patriot party. These committees later, at times, exercised judicial, legislative and executive functions. These, in turn, developed into Committees of Safety which guided and stabilized the revolutionary movement.

In spite of the fact that the first meeting of the Tryon County Committee of Safety was held on August 27, 1774, the initial meetings of that body were surprisingly conciliatory in nature, containing professions of allegiance to King George III and stressing "our greatest Happiness to be governed by the Laws of Great Britain..." (9) One of the members of that first committee was Christopher P Yates who had been initiated in St. Patrick's Lodge, 7 November, 1767. However, Christopher Yates left St. Patrick's Lodge after he had petitioned Sir John Johnson, Provincial Grand Master, on October 4, 1773 for a dispensation for a warrant for St. George's Lodge in Schenectady, had been named as Master of St. George's Lodge on September 14, 1774. (10)

It was not until May 19, 1775 that The Tryon County Palatine Committee of Safety chaired by Christopher Yates became openly hostile and wrote a letter to the Committee of Albany which stated in part "This County has for a series of Years been Ruled by one family, the different Branches of which are still strenuous (sic) in

dissuading people from coming into Congressional Measures, and even have last Week at a numerous Meeting of the Mohawk District appeared with all their Dependants armed to oppose the people from considering of their Grievances, their Number being so large and the people unarmed, struck Terror into most of them and they dispersed."(11) This was the first open sign of revolutionary trouble in the Mohawk Valley.

However, even if some minutes of the meetings of St. Patrick's Lodge have been lost, we must look on the fact that any of the colonial minutes survived at all as fortunate. The last surviving colonial minutes were dated Thursday 4 May 1774 and Samuel Sutton the first cabinet maker in Johnstown(12) acted as secretary. In the minutes he is described as "Jo", secretary, presumably "joint" Secretary. In the previous meeting on 7 April 1774 Robert "Adems" (sometimes spelled Adams) is described as Secretary. It would further seem that Robert Adams had been secretary for the years 1770, 1771, 1772, 1773 and 1774 and is described as such when he was present. It is interesting to note that the Secretary, Robert Adams who lived in Johnstown and was a provision merchant with a store in Johnstown, (13,14) engaged himself on the Royalist side at the commencement of hostilities in the Indian Department serving under Col. Daniel Claus.(15) At the time of the last recorded meetings of St. Patrick's Lodge prior to the Revolution, Daniel Claus, the son-in-law of Sir William Johnson, was Senior Warden.(16)

It was to be expected that Robert Adams who spelled his name in the Minutes of the Lodge as "Adems" would initially join with the Johnson hierarchy on the Royalist side. Sir William Johnson had not only been his best customer

personally but also had contracted with Adams for supplies for the Indian Department of which Sir William was "Sole Superintendent" for the Northern Department. (17,18) One account alone for August 17, 1770 was paid in the amount of £2523/4s/6d. (20), (19) Further, Robert Adams had acted as a secretary for Sir William Johnson. (20) As well, Adams was left a large legacy in Sir William's will in which Johnson bequeathed "To my faithful friend, Robert Adams Esq., of Johnstown, the dwelling house, other buildings, and the lot and one acre of land whereon he now lives, the Potash laboratory, and one acre of land with it; also the farm which he holds by deed from me, all free from rent during his natural life, except the quit rent." Robert Adams was also named as an executor in the will. (21) For this service Adams was bequeathed a ring in token of Sir William's gratitude, as were the other executors whose number totalled fourteen. While Robert Adams served in the Indian Department he was able to have his wife join him at the British fort at Carleton Island on the St. Lawrence (22) where he was Indian Officer.

There is an element of surprise in the fact that during the time that Adams was ostensibly serving the British cause, he secretly wrote to the Tryon County Committee of Safety for permission to go home. Permission was granted "Provided, he Signs and Swear (sic) to the oath of Allegiance (sic) to the State of New York." (23) Adams was able to return but it could not have been before March 17, 1779 since Claus was still mentioning him in his reports to Haldimand on that date. (24) He attended the first post-war recorded meeting of St. Patrick's Lodge which was held on Saturday 30 July, 1785. At that time he had advanced to Junior Warden.

There is even some doubt that this was, in fact, the first meeting of the Lodge following the revolution. The Minutes of the Grand Lodge of New York, dated 16 June 1784, reveal that a letter had been received from the Right Worshipful Peter W. Yates requesting that since the patent of St. Patrick's Lodge, in Tryon County was taken off to Canada or destroyed, Zephaniah Batchellor, (sic) as Master, Robert Adams, Senior, and Christopher P. Yates, Junior Wardens, "be issued a new one, which was so directed. (25) This indicates that St. Patrick's Lodge had met, elected its officers and made the request to Grand Lodge prior to 23 June, 1784. Thus, the meeting of 30 July 1785 could not have been the first post-revolutionary meeting and we must conclude that the minutes were either lost or improperly kept. There are no minutes of an election.

The war of independence had a heavy impact upon the hierarchy of Freemasonry in the Province of New York. The Grand Master was Sir John Johnson Bt., the son of the first Master of St. Patrick's Lodge at Johnstown, New York, the Grand Senior Warden and Deputy Grand Master was Dr. Peter Middleton and Goldsbrow Banyar, the Grand Junior Warden.

Sir John Johnson was born at Mount Johnson, (near the present Amsterdam,) New York, 5 November 1741. (26) Being the only but not necessarily legitimate son of Sir William Johnson, inasmuch as there is no evidence that Sir William was ever married, John Johnson became entitled to be knighted because of the fact that his father had become a baronet in 1755. This privilege was not revoked until 1827. (27) However, before John Johnson could be created a knight it was necessary that he receive the accolade from his king, George III and attain

the age of twenty-one.(28) There had been no need for his father to so do since baronetcies do not require an investiture.(29) Thus, John Johnson went to England in 1765 when he was 23.(30) On 18 November, 1765 he arrived in London where he put up in Half Moon Street, Piccadilly.(31) He described his audience with King George III four days later:

"the Gracious reception I met with from My Royal Master was beyond my expectation for on the fourth day After my Arrival when I was presented His Majesty was most Graciously pleased to knight me - I have been presented likewise to the Queen & Duke of York Who received me Verry Graciously - "(32)

This was a heady experience for a young man who lived on the frontier of the Province of New York. His lodgings in Half Moon Street were within a short walking distance of St. James's Palace which was the chief residence of the royal court at the time.(33) In spite of Sir John's knighthood, his father Sir William continued to address him as "My Dear Child".(34)

It was during his time in London that Sir John was initiated into Freemasonry. He was entered, passed and raised to the degree of a Master Mason in the Royal Lodge at St. James's when he was twenty-five years old in 1766.(35) Before he left London, he was commissioned as Provincial Grand Master of New York by Lord Blaney in 1767.(36) There were, of course, two surprising elements to John Johnson's elevation. Firstly, he had only been initiated a year before and secondly, the Province of New York already had a Provincial Grand Master, George Harison, who was doing a good job.(37) McClenachan described Harison's masonic life as "preeminently deserving of praise".(38)

Insofar as his junior status in Freemasonry is concerned, time of service in the Craft seems to have been unimportant, even in England, at the time for promotion to Grand Master. Lord Blaney's date of initiation is unknown, but his successor, the Duke of Beaufort (1767-71) was only a member prior to 1768, and Lord Petre (1772-6) was only initiated in 1771.(39) Masonry was in a state of rapid growth and obviously did not have a sufficient number of members of experience to fill its vacancies. We realize that at that time youth was no barrier to high promotion when we recall that Pitt the Younger became prime minister before he was twenty-five in 1783.

George Harison demonstrated that he was successfully fulfilling his position as Provincial Grand Master of New York in that, while Sir John's appointment was dated in England in 1767, he chose not to assume his duties until 1771 and allowed Harison to continue until that time.(40) During the time that Sir John was engaged as Provincial Grand Master, it would appear that only one lodge, namely St. George's Lodge, Schenectady in 1774, was warranted.(41)

Dr. Peter Middleton, who served as Senior Grand Warden to George Harison, was appointed as Deputy Provincial Grand Master by Sir John Johnson and it was Dr. Middleton who carried on the work of the Provincial Grand Lodge after Sir John was obliged to flee to Canada in 1776 until his own death in 1781.(42) (43) Dr. Middleton was extremely popular.(44) He was born in Scotland and took the degree of Doctor of Medicine from the University of St. Andrews about 27 February 1752.(45) He was one of the most eminent physicians in New York prior to the revolution.(46) It was in New York that he and Dr. John Bard made one of the first dissec-

tions of the human body for purposes of medical instruction in America some time around 1752. He was also a founder of the Medical School of King's College (now Columbia) in New York City and taught physiology, pathology and materia medica there. Middleton was also one of the incorporators of New York Hospital in 1771.(47)

It would seem that Peter Middleton first encountered Sir John Johnson's father William Johnson when Middleton served as surgeon of the New York Regiment under Johnson who was commander and provincial major-general in an expedition to Lake George in northern New York in October 1755.(48) As commander, Johnson, who was made a baronet after the successful conclusion of the operation, protected Dr. Middleton who was charged with disorderly conduct and insubordination involving vile language.(49) With the advent of the revolution in 1776 he supported the loyalist cause and the Provincial Congress permitted him to visit Governor William Tryon who had been obliged to seek refuge with his family on the ship *Duchess of Gordon* anchored in New York harbour in February 1776 "until further order".(50) Dr. Middleton died in New York on January 9, 1781 while New York City, which has been retaken, was still in British hands. His only son John Bruce Banyar Middleton, who was a student in New Jersey when the revolution began, returned to New York in 1779. After the death of his father he worked as a surgeon's mate in the general Hospital in New York. In 1784 John went to England with £300 which he had inherited from his father intending to go to Edinburgh to finish his education. He received £50 sterling per annum from the Loyalist Claims Commissioners.(51) Upon the death of Peter Middleton, the Provincial Grand Lodge of New York became extinct.(52)

Goldsbrow Banyar, as Junior Grand Warden was totally unlike his Masonic brother, Dr. Middleton. He was born in London in 1724 and went to America when he was fourteen. He rose quickly in colonial government service in the Province of New York. In 1746 he became Deputy Secretary of the colony, Deputy Clerk of the Council and Deputy Clerk of the Supreme Court. Six years later he was appointed Registrar of the Court of Chancery and in 1753, Judge of Probate. (53) To emphasize this rapid rise the council minutes of December 22, 1743 reveal that on that early date he was one of two door-keepers of that body. (54)

Banyar was a close friend and confidant of Sir William Johnson. Their letters commenced to be exchanged as early as May 18, 1751 when Banyar acknowledged an application from William Johnson for a patent concerning lands. (55) Even at the time of his reply, Banyar realized that Johnson's friendship would be useful to himself. One of Johnson's biographers noted shrewdly that "As perpetual Under-Secretary of New York, Goldsbrow Banyar was manipulating the routine services of the government to give himself a nice fortune and inconspicuous power. Banyar foresaw a new war with France: the best way for a fat little functionary to stay strong in wartime was to attach himself to a hero. The huge Indian colonel looked like such a hero, and certainly needed guidance through the china shop of colonial politics. (56) Johnson was even more useful than a mere hero could ever be. As a friend and confidant of the Six Native Indians who was also in 1751 the Indian Agent for the Province of New York, Johnson was in a unique position to secure Indian lands for himself and his friends for nominal consideration. Johnson and Banyar became good companions.

The first problem to be solved was British colonial land policy. When Sir Danvers Osborne became governor of New York in 1753, his instructions included six articles dealing with land grants. The ceiling on individual grants was cut to one thousand acres.(57) Prior to that date the grants were only one thousand acres if the lands were upon a river, but after 1753 it was law for all land grants. Banyar counselled Johnson how to fraudulently circumvent the law. His advice was that Johnson should "follow the custom" by suppressing his own name and substituting "the names of friends", one for each thousand acres who could be relied on to convey the land to Johnson after it had been patented.(58) It was an age of unbridled capitalism with no conflict of interest guidelines.

Cadwallader Colden, a member of the governor's council and lieutenant-governor of New York 1761-76, carried out the same practices as those recommended by Banyar.(59) Almost everyone in authority seemed motivated by self-interest. Even Benjamin Franklin and his son, Governor William Franklin of New Jersey, sought, together with Sir William Johnson, to set up their own private colony in the Illinois country which was only aborted by the death of Johnson and the American Revolution.(60)

Both Sir William Johnson and Goldsbrow Banyar became rich and their friendship became closer. Johnson even arranged for Banyar to have female companionship when Banyar came to the Mohawk Valley and Albany. Writing to Banyar on April 2, 1762, he promised "Should you deign to pay me a visit, I shall endeavour to make everything agreeable to you, and introduce you to a Princess of the first Rank here, who had large possessions, as well as parts, provided I

could be assured of your paying her more civility than you did to the lady I shewed you at Albany, and discharging ye necessary Duty, wh. men of years and infirmities are seldom capable of." (61)

The outbreak of the American revolution and the end of Royal government in New York obliged Banyar to make a decision as to his future course of action. While he was nominally Royalist in feeling, (62) the self-sacrifice which would be implied in electing to support either side in the conflict was not for him. Instead, he chose to remove himself to Rhinebeck near the east side of the Hudson river. (63) Rhinebeck, which is situated in Dutchess County, was both a village and an area about midway between Albany and New York. In May 1761, Banyar and others had applied for a patent for a grant of 13,000 acres of land east of Kinderhook (64) and it may have been that he settled during the war upon that very land. Being about eighty miles from New York, it was far enough away to be outside of the ambit of British power in New York City which would have obliged Banyar to take sides. Unfortunately for Banyar, the Bogardus Tavern (now the Beekman Arms) at Rhinebeck became the local headquarters of the patriots during the war and a company of Continental Irregulars trained on the lawn. (65) Thus, when Sir Henry Clinton, the British military commander of New York contemplated a military expedition up the Hudson to Esopus, in October 1777, (66) he sent a sealed despatch to Banyar and asked for information as to the best mode of attacking that place. After the officer and his attendants had been properly entertained, Banyar dismissed them with a sealed letter for Sir Henry which, upon being opened, was found to contain the laconic reply "Mr. Banyar knows nothing." (67) Ultimately, Banyar was loyal

only to Banyar.

In 1767, Banyar married Elizabeth Mortier, daughter of the paymaster-general and widow of John Appy, Judge-Advocate of H.M. forces in America.(68) By Elizabeth, he had three children, Martha, Hariot and Goldsborough (sic) Banyar.(69) At the close of hostilities Banyar moved to Albany where he took a great interest in the affairs of the state.(70) It was during this time that the second Episcopalian church was built in 1803.(71) It is ironical that as a churchwarden, Banyar was custodian of the set of silver communion plate which was presented to the church by its founding patron Queen Anne in 1712(72) and which is inscribed with her name and cipher on each of the seven pieces of massive silver.

In 1786, an American seal of approval was fixed upon Goldsbrow Banyar. In that year he was appointed, in conjunction with General Philip Schuyler and Elkanah Watson, a commissioner to examine and report on the making of a canal from Wood Creek to the Mohawk River and generally as to the most judicious plan in making that river navigable.(73) Blind in the last years of his life, he was led about the streets by a coloured servant.(74) He survived his wife by seven years and died at Albany "full of years and honours", on the 4th of November, 1815 at the age of 91 years.(75) His name as a churchwarden appeared on an inscription on the front of St. Peter's Church, Albany when it was rebuilt in 1802 along with that of the other churchwarden, rector and architect.(76) The church was rebuilt in 1858 and the plaque removed. His son Goldsbrow predeceased him in New York in 1806.(77) According to an unknown writer quoted by Lorenzo Sabine, the American historian, he died "leaving to his descendants a

large fortune, and a more enduring inheritance, - the recollection of his many virtues and the example of a life devoted to duty." (78) The facts would seem to indicate otherwise.

To turn to the effects of the revolution upon the individual members of St. Patrick's Lodge, three facts would appear to be worthy of consideration. Firstly, a statute passed by the new legislature of the State of New York entitled An Act For The Forfeiture And Sale Of The Property Of The Estates of Persons Who Have Adhered To The Enemies Of This State passed on October 22, 1779, (79) secondly, the establishment of a Loyalist Claims Commission by the Parliament of Great Britain in July 1783 and finally, the creation of Land Boards in British North America which rewarded those who had adhered to the Royalist cause during the revolution. The first statute was, of course, punitive to "the King's Men" and the latter two creations ameliorated their condition, one by way of compensation and the other by way of reward.

The Act For Forfeiture And Sale was an act of attainder. All those loyalists named in the statute (80) and all those unnamed persons who had committed treason against the State of New York which included "voluntarily withdrawing to any place within the power of possession of the king of Great Britain" (81) and not returning or escaping were included in the penalties prescribed for those loyalists who had been specifically named in the Act. An Act of Attainder was not new in English law. It meant, simply, that when a person convicted of treason or felony was sentenced to death for the same, or when judgement of outlawry for treason or felony was pronounced against anyone, he was said to be "attainted" and the fact was called

an "attainder". His property was forfeited and his blood was said to be corrupted.(82) Thus his heirs could not inherit his property even after his death. An Act of Attainder simply abolished the need for a trial if the person attainted was specifically named in the statute. This legal step was popular with the Tudors, when the king's suspected enemies were named in Acts of Attainder. Henry VIII was able, by this means, to get rid of his Lord Chancellor, Thomas Cromwell, who stood in the way of Henry's divorce from Anne of Cleves, without the necessity of a trial.(83) The Act provided for death without benefit of clergy,(84) banishment from the State(85) and the loss of all real and personal property.(86)

Thus, the Provincial Grand Master, Sir John Johnson, Guy Johnson, Master of St. Patrick's Lodge and brother-in-law of Sir John, Daniel Claus, Senior Warden of St. Patrick's Lodge and brother-in-law of Sir John, and John Butler, Joint Junior Warden of St. Patrick's Lodge, who were all named specifically in the Act of Attainder, were financially ruined in the State of New York. Also specifically named was John-Joost Herkimer, a farmer in Tryon County who was the brother of the more famous Nicolas Herkimer who had been initiated into St. Patrick's Lodge on 7 April, 1767.

Some members of St. Patrick's Lodge who, while not being precisely named in the Act but subject, nevertheless, to its penalties, had no property, real or personal, to forfeit. These included Edward Wall, the schoolteacher at Johnstown and Gilbert Tice, the innkeeper who ran the inn owned by Sir William Johnson.

Edward Wall, an Irishman, was initiated into St. Patrick's Lodge on 6 September, 1770.

(87) He had been brought to Johnstown in 1769 as the schoolteacher and housed in a house, still standing and now known as "the Drumm House", by Sir William Johnson who owned the property and the school.(88) The school had 45 pupils and was , of necessity, inter-racial because of Sir William's illegitimate children by his Mohawk housekeeper, Molly Brant. (89) He maintained strict discipline in the school mixed with instruction on such matters as social etiquette. (90) Initially Wall appeared to side with the Patriot cause in spite of the fact that he married Deborah Butler, the daughter of Col. John Butler, who was a strong Tory, on July 6, 1772. (91) He was a member of the Tryon Committee of Safety from May 24, 1774 to June 17, 1775, at which time he asked to be excused from the Committee and was granted his discharge. Prior to that time, the proceedings of the Committee had not yet become overtly rebellious. Because of the fact that he had been occasionally used in Indian matters by Sir William Johnson his patron, (92) Edward Wall joined the British Indian Department on active service.(93) His wife Deborah was taken into custody by the order of the Tryon County Committee of Safety dated August 25, 1777 and was confined until further notice along with the wives of other loyalists in Gilbert Tice's "house" at Johnstown.(94) The other wives included Mrs. Annatje Ten Broeck, wife of Peter Ten Broeck who was a captain in Butler's Corps of Rangers and a member of St. Patrick's Lodge since 7 February, 1771. Mrs. Ten Broeck was also niece of Nicolas Herkimer. Also detained were Deborah Wall's mother Catalynje (Catherine) Butler, wife of Col. John Butler(95) and finally, Gilbert Tice's wife, Christina. The "house" was undoubtedly Tice's Inn which was on William Street in Johnstown.(96)

Wall survived the war and settled in Niagara. He made no claim for indemnity to the Loyalist Claims Commission because he was not a freeholder of land prior to the war. He was dead, however by the time that the "Old U.E. List" was made part of an Order-In-Council of 9 November, 1789.

Gilbert Tice proved that the loss of the revolutionary war was not necessary the case of winner takes all. Tice was born possibly in the province of New Jersey in 1738.(97) He married Christina (born 21 September, 1739) the daughter of Cornelius Van Slyk a Schenectady trader (98) on May 30, 1761,(99) The couple had two children, a daughter baptized Jannetje, March 21, 1762 and a son, David, on May 6, 1764.(100) Prior to his marriage, Gilbert Tice served in the provincial forces against the French in the Seven Years War.(101)

Following his marriage, Tice's name appeared in various applications for land grants but it seems probable that his name was used on these occasions by those more powerful than himself to circumvent the colonial land regulations which limited individual grants to one thousand acres. On February 24, 1768, Tice's name was added to a patent issued to Michael Byrne, Frances Rupert and Lucan Veddor by the governor's council.(102) Michael Byrne was a charter member of St. Patrick's Lodge, as was Tice. On December 5, 1768 his name was added to a lengthy list of names to be added to a patent applied for by Johannes Lawyer, a solicitor for Sir William Johnson and Moses Ibbit, a fellow member of St. Patrick's Lodge.(103) Yet another petition was granted to Tice, and others including Jelles Fonda, Michael Byrne and Robert Adams who were all members of St. Patrick's Lodge on March 22, 1769.(104)

Tice had not only been a member of St. Patrick's Lodge since 23 May, 1766(105) but he was the first Innkeeper in Johnstown running the Inn built and owned by Sir William Johnson.(106) In 1764, he was nominated as a captain by Sir William Johnson in the Albany County Militia.(107)

In is capacity as innkeeper, Tice supplied the necessary food and refreshments for the meetings of St. Patrick's Lodge which were held at Johnson Hall, Sir William's residence. The accounts, which were sizeable, were paid by Sir William. For example, Tice's statement of account for liquor, beer and wine for the Lodge refreshments for August 1768 to May 29, 1770 amount to £154.17s.8d. This account was for the Lodge which met only monthly and did not include food.(108) While Tice was never an officer of St. Patrick's Lodge, his attendance after his entry on 23 May 1766 until May 5 1774 was regular.(109)

A crisis arose in Tice's life in 1772 when he was imprisoned for debt at Albany which was the county town before the creation of Tryon county. Imprisonment of a judgement debtor was the law of England until 1869 when the practice was abolished by the Debtors Act(110) and by the law of the State of New York until 1831.(111) At the time of Tice's imprisonment the typical jail has been described as "a corrupt inefficient institution - a warehouse for the dregs of society. Men and women were thrown into common cell rooms. Administration was totally unprofessional. Dirt and ordure were everywhere. Discipline was lax; yet brutality went unchecked."(112) The jail at Albany in which Tice was imprisoned was built following an Act passed by the provincial assembly in 1743 to enable the raising of £400 by the city offi-

cials to finish and complete the court house and jail for the city and county of Albany. In a letter written to the Lords of Trade dated 19 June 1743, Lieutenant-Governor George Clarke explained that "This is a necessary Act for without it the work begun would remain unfinished and no criminals or debtors could be secured. (113)

Gilbert Tice was incarcerated in the Albany Jail because he had failed to pay a merchant John Lamb of New York for goods sold and delivered ten years previously in 1762. This was an unconscionably long time, since the goods which consisted of rum, stockings, soap, candles and "four quarter casks of Lisbon wine" (114) had undoubtedly been resold by Tice. Lamb, had to press Tice, since Lamb's creditors were pressing for payment and had brought action against him. (115) Tice did not pay and consequently was imprisoned. This was followed by pathetic letters from Tice to Sir William Johnson, the richest and most powerful man in the area, who owned the inn which Tice operated at Johnstown who was the only key to Tice's release. In a letter written from jail on January 23, 1772 to Sir William he asked for help. "I beag & pray of you to fall on Sum means or other to Git me Hom again as Soon as possible that is with Saiftey to your Self..." He also asked Sir William to call on his wife as often as possible "for my wiff was varey much Cast Down when I Left hom..." (116) Inasmuch as Mrs. Tice's family, the Van Slyck's, were people of substance who were known and respected in the Schenectady area, (117) it would have been a shattering experience for Christina Tice.

Sir William did, in fact, secure the release of Tice, firstly by posting his own personal bond, and then later, by paying the Judgement

in full. The amount of the money due and owing was 724 pounds.(118) Tice had other creditors as well but they did not bring action to legally enforce their claims.

A highly significant postscript to this episode which seems to have been totally ignored by previous writers(119) is that Sir William then brought actions against Gilbert Tice in the Tryon County Court of Common Pleas at Johnstown on June 10, 1773 for the moneys which Johnson had paid on Tice's behalf in the sum of £724 which was a huge sum in those days. Tice, who was nominally represented by Walter Butler, the son of Col. John Butler, the then Senior Warden of St. Patrick's Lodge, as his attorney, did not defend the action.(120) While Sir William did nothing to enforce his Judgement, it gave Sir William and his heirs the power to put Tice back in jail at any time because of the unsatisfied judgement. Thus, if Tice did anything to displease Sir William Johnson or later, Sir William's residual beneficiary Sir John Johnson, he could be deprived of his freedom.

During the War of the Revolution, Tice served as a captain in the British Indian Department and his war service was exemplary. He had been commissioned eleven years earlier in 1764 on the recommendation of Capt. Daniel Campbell of Schenectady in a letter to Sir William Johnson, dated 20 February, who in turn submitted Tice's name to the Lieutenant-Governor as a provincial company commander. Johnson informed the Lieutenant-Governor that Tice has served as an officer for some years.(121) Interestingly, Capt. Daniel Campbell was later initiated into St. Patrick's Lodge on 4 April, 1767. It is highly unlikely that Tice's contribution to the British war effort was motivated

by fear of the Johnson's however since his service was totally committed and not merely time-serving. At law, Tice would have benefitted more by American victory than British since after the Act of Attainder of 1779, Sir John Johnson had no legal rights in the State of New York so therefore the judgement could not have been enforced against Tice. Certainly, after 1783, the King's writ no longer flowed in the Mohawk Valley.

Tice's war service commenced early. He was wounded in action near St. Johns, Quebec on September 6, 1775 when he was shot through the thigh. (122) The wound could not have been serious since he accompanied Col. Guy Johnson, Master of St. Patrick's Lodge and superintendent of the British Indian Department and Joseph Brant, a Mohawk who was brother of the late Sir William Johnson's mistress, Molly Brant, and who was a secretary in the Indian department, to England in December 1775. They sailed from Quebec on November 11, 1775. (123) The real purpose of a trip was Guy Johnson's feeling that his Indian Department had not received the assistance which he felt he needed and deserved from the British authorities in Canada. Sir Guy Carleton, the Governor of Quebec, had forbidden the Canadian Indians to pass beyond the limits of the colony, (124) thus ruining the flexibility of Johnson's forces. As well, proper military supplies had not been forthcoming for Johnson to equip his force of irregulars. Last, but not least, Carleton had appointed Major John Campbell agent for Indian Affairs in the Province of Quebec, thus threatening Guy Johnson's supremacy over the Indians, since he was now left only in control of the Six Nations, because the boundaries of Quebec had been greatly extended by the Quebec Act of 1774 to include the country between the Great Lakes, the Ohio

and the Mississippi.

It was of course no time for Guy Johnson and Claus and their party to leave North America. They were the two highest officials in the Indian Department and had been swallowed up in a war but did not seem to be able to put aside petty bickering long enough to fight the enemy. The same day that they sailed from Quebec, Governor Carleton had been obliged to flee Montreal by ship to Quebec and the following month Montgomery and Arnold joined forces below Quebec for their final assault upon the citadel. There is no doubt that Guy Johnson's duty was with the Mohawks and their allies in resisting the attack. The same applied to Claus. Instead, they chose to play the game of politics in England. Howard Swiggett says "They were a dull and selfish pair given to writing letters." (125)

Tice was given the task of looking after Joseph Brant and another young Mohawk warrior named John whom Johnson and Claus had taken to England in much the same fashion as Colonel Francis Nicholson and Colonel Peter Schuyler had taken Indians, known under the pretext that they were "American Kings" to the Court of Queen Anne in 1710. (126) Indians had been seen in England since Cabot brought back Indians to the Court of Henry VII. Later George Weymouth brought back five Indians from the coast of Maine. Shakespeare appears to refer to one of the Indians brought to England by Weymouth when in The Tempest (127) Trinculo says "when they will not give a doit to relieve a lame beggar, they will lay out ten to see a dead Indian." (128) Pocahontas was in the same mould. Thus, Johnson and Claus took the two Indians to England in 1776 undoubtedly to give the mission a higher and more important status than it, in

fact, deserved.

The mission seemed successful. Tice and Brant first met James Boswell, Dr. Samuel Johnson's later biographer, on Thursday, April 18, 1776 at a Subscription City Ball in the Haberdasher's Hall. (129) Boswell was introduced to Captain Tice. Boswell recorded in his diary:

"I was told that an officer whom I saw here had conducted the Chief to England. I began conversation with him, and found him very affable. He told me that his name was Tice. And he did which should always (sic) be done when a name is mentioned for the first time: he spelt it -T-i-c-e-. The ear never almost catches a new name exactly, so it should be assisted by spelling. He was of English extraction, but had never been in Britain before. He had served in the last war, and during the present troubles in America had been at Fort St. John with my cousin, Major Charles Preston, having with him this Mohawk Chief and a good many Indians. But he had left it in September. He spoke with high esteem of Preston, and I am not sure whether it was before or after knowing my connection with him that, upon proposing to pay him a visit, he said he would be glad to see me any morning to drink tea with the chief and him at the Swan with two necks in Lad Lane. They had put up at that inn on their arrival in London, and the Chief thought the people so civil that he would not leave the house to go into lodging." (130)

It was a great coincidence that Major Charles Preston had, in fact, commanded the defence of the little fort at St. Johns, Quebec, against a superior force of attacking continentals commanded by Major-General Philip

Schuyler. Preston had been greatly outnumbered by the advancing American army. However, as two of the advancing companies of the 5th Connecticut Regiment approached the fort, and were crossing a deep, muddy winding stream, they were ambushed by a hundred Indians commanded by Tice who subjected them to a surprising blast of close fire. Schuyler's force suffered eight killed or fatally wounded and a further eight were wounded, including both American company commanders. (131) The fight and the flight of Schuyler's troops caused jubilation in Montreal. The engagement was blown out of proportion with numbers being exaggerated. Montreal celebrated "with a grand mass with a Te Deum." (132) Ward noted that "If anything were needed to ensure the abstention of the Canadians from joining Schuyler, this retreat provided it." (133)

Boswell was extremely interested in both Brant and Tice. In spite of the fact that Brant was not an actual chief but merely a war chief or pine tree chief, he was, in English eyes, colourful and further he could speak English. It was not in Guy Johnson's interest to lessen Brant's stature. It was 1710 all over again. Brant had already been received with Guy Johnson by King George III at St. James' Palace on Friday, February 29th and by Lord George Germain, who filled the post similar to that of colonial secretary, two weeks later. (134) Boswell, in fact, produced an article on Joseph Brant which mentioned Gilbert Tice in The London Magazine, in the July 1776 edition.

The delegation which had gone to England returned and landed on Staten Island on 29 July 1776, after an engagement with American warships near Bermuda. It was there that they received word from a man from the Mohawk River of

Sir John Johnson's flight from Johnstown overland to Canada. (135)

During the rest of the war, Tice did his duty as a captain in the Indian Department. He served in 1777 at St. Leger's siege of Fort Stanwix and fought at the bloody encounter at Oriskany. (136) He was described by Sir Guy Carelton on 2 October, 1777 as "a capable person and one in whom entire confidence may be placed." (137) He was at Ticonderoga in 1777 and in 1778 he was in the expedition to German Flats. (138) In 1781 with his Indians he was engaged in an expedition to the Mohawk Valley. (139)

The coming of peace in 1783 obliged the Loyalists to give up all hope of returning to their homes in what was now the United States of America. On June 25, 1785, Tice was obliged to take the oath of allegiance. (140) This would seem to be redundant in light of his war service to the Crown but was necessitated because of the large number of Americans who immigrated into Canada following the Revolution and who cared more for cheap fertile available land than any desire to follow the British flag. (141)

Niagara and its surrounding countryside was initially inhospitable. Of the whole country, Richard Cartwright of Kingston wrote in 1810, that "Twenty-six years ago this province was a howling wilderness, little known and less cultivated." (142)

Gilbert Tice and his wife settled in what was originally known as the Home District (Niagara) and were recorded in "The Old U.E. List" as having brought four servants (143) and they are noted as having drawn rations in 1786 which were provided by the British military at Fort Niagara in what is now the United States.

It was not until after the Jay Treaty of 1794 that the border forts, "Western Posts" including Fort Niagara, were vacated in 1796 and British troops withdrawn from American soil. (144) The Tices brought none of their family with them since their only surviving child, a daughter Rebecca, had married Zephaniah Batchelor of Johnstown and Batchelor, who was a builder, (145) was a member of the Tryon Committee of Safety from the Mohawk District. In 1784 after the war, he served as an Assistant Justice in Tryon (now Montgomery) County, New York. (146). Batchelor was the first Master of St. Patrick's Lodge upon its reorganization in July 1785. (147) The fact that Zephaniah Batchelor had adhered to the republican cause caused Tice to become bitter. In his Last Will and Testament dated 8th December, 1790 (148) Tice, who mistakenly referred to his son-in-law as "Ebenezer" Batchelor in his will, provided that the residue of his estate was to be delivered to his wife "Christian" (sic) for her lifetime and upon her death to be equally divided between his nephew David Bastedo "who now resided with me" and his son-in-law "Ebenezer Batchelor" "on condition that the said Ebenezer Batchelor becomes a loyal subject of Great Britain and resides in the British dominions." Batchelor was given twelve months to make his election after Mrs. Tice's death and failing, David Bastedo was to get the whole estate. Undoubtedly the reason why Tice did not directly name his only daughter Rebecca in his Will was because of the fact that since Rebecca was married, she could not take title to property in her own name at that time since at common law the property of the wife became that of the husband. This situation was not rectified until the Married Women's Property Act of 1882.

The feeling was not entirely reciprocated

on the part of Zephaniah Batchelor to his father-in-law. It is poignant that Batchelor named his only son who was born 8 March, 1781 "Gilbert" after the child's maternal grandfather. (149) Gilbert Tice never saw the little boy nor his infant granddaughter Elizabeth Batchelor who was born on 12 May, 1776 (150) while Gilbert Tice was in England with Guy Johnson and Joseph Brant.

Arthur Lower summed up the feelings of the Loyalists: (151)

"The anti-republican animus of all the Loyalists, great and small, made it certain that there would be a second group of English communities in North America and supplied for them a common bond, the primary expression of which was anti-Americanism and the secondary, strong sentiment of loyalty to the conception 'British'."

From another viewpoint, the Loyalists were Americans with the net of anti-Americanism holding them together and at the same time they were bound together by loyalty to Great Britain, a country which most of them had never seen and to a king, George III who was in and out of mental illness and who has since been diagnosed by a famous Harley Street medical specialist, R. Scott Stephenson, F.R.C.S., as being subject to "periodic psychosis of hypomanic type." (152) It was most certainly the King's reactionary colonial policies which provided the catalyst to the American revolution. Sir George Otto Trevelyan in his great classic The American Revolution illustrates how the King's mental instability provoked the war and noted that the king "made no attempt to conceal his satisfaction when he learned that the quarrel could not be patched up." (153) This was scarcely the

reaction of a mentally stable monarch. He died in 1820, deaf, blind and totally mad. (154)

On a more positive side, the Loyalists had a further common denominator which was respect and obedience to legally constituted authority, without which stable government cannot be guaranteed. They saw their path of duty through a different prism than that of those who chose independence and they were no less courageous than their republican brothers in fighting for the cause which they considered to be right.

Gilbert Tice did not return to innkeeping in the promised land but instead took up farming in Stamford Township on the Niagara peninsula and, as well, was appointed to several semi-judicial posts. At the time of his death in 1791 he had been issued 1100 acres of Crown land. (155) The home which he built was an attractive one which Elizabeth Simcoe described in her diary entry of 18 July, 1793, as "a pleasant situation like some in Epping Forest..." (156) The place was so attractive that the Simcoes spent two weeks later with Mrs. Tice in August 1795 because of the heat in Newark, bow Niagara-on-the-Lake. Mrs. Simcoe's diary entry for August 11th recorded "We rode to Judge Powell's dined at Mrs. Tice's & obtained her consent to our staying a fortnight at her House. She is to give us two rooms & we are to have a Tent pitched for the Servants. This situation is peculiarly dry & healthy on the Mountain 5 miles from the Fall of Niagara. There is a shed or gallery before the House & some oak trees close to it, therefore there is always shade and cool here when we are suffering from intense heat at Navy Hall." (157) All but one of the diary entries were filled with Mrs. Simcoe's delight with the farm and the general area which was near the whirlpool on the Niaga-

ra river. Alas! Her note of September 15th, 1795, recorded "I fell thro a trap door in my Room into a Cellar but was not very much bruised." (158) All of the other entries were of pleasant things. On August 31st she observed that "Mrs. Tice has the finest melons imaginable. I prefer Water Melons & eat two or three every day. The Indian corn is now just in a proper state for boiling or roasting, it begins to turn yellow. Francis (her son) & I dine upon it. All the vegetables are particularly good & I eat little else. ... The People here in the summer live chiefly on vegetables and a little salt pork." (159) "Now the wild pidgeons are coming of which there is such numbers that besides those they roast & eat at present they salt the wings and breasts of them in barrels & at any time they are good to eat after being soaked. There is a pond before this House where hundreds of them drink at a time, it is singular that this Pond rises and falls as the River does tho it is such an immense height above it. The May apples are now a great luxury, I have had some preserved, & the hurtleberries are ripe." (160)

For Christina Tice to entertain viceroyalty was a long way from the time when her husband had been in Debtor's Prison. While it is likely that the Tices had provided accommodation for Governor William Tryon and his wife when the Governor dedicated the new court house at Johnstown in 1772, it was not the relationship of hosts and guests except in the broadest sense. (161) Lord Dorchester, the Governor of Quebec, was also at the house to attend a meeting around 1787, during the lifetime of Gilbert Tice. (162) The reason for the visits was not that the house was a very grand one, but rather the fact that Newark, the closest town, had little that was better. It was described by the

anonymous author of Canadian Letters as "a poor, wretched straggling village with a few scattered cottages erected here and there by chance, convenience or caprice dictated. The Governor's house is distinguished by the name of Navy Hall. A family accustomed to the conveniences of England must have found this a most uncomfortable abode." (163)

Although Tice had elected to become a farmer, other appointments semi-judicial in nature were conferred upon him. On 18 August, 1787, he was recommended by his old friend Lieutenant-Colonel John Butler to be a Judge of Common Pleas and as well for an appointment to a civil office of trust. (164) In fact, Tice was commissioned as Sheriff of the District of Nassau about July 24, 1788. (165) Nassau had as its original name Home District and the courts sat at Newark, now Niagara-on-the-Lake. (166) More duties were added later. Lord Dorchester appointed him to the Land Board of the District of Nassau as of 1 May 1791 (167) prior to which Tice was appointed a Commissioner of the Roads, on March 31, 1790. (168) Carnochan misdescribes him as Clerk of the Court of Common Pleas in 1795, which was four years after he died. (169)

There appear to be no masonic records describing Gilbert Tice's involvement in the Craft in Canada. However, coincidentally, the first lodge in Stamford Township, namely lodge No.12, met at the house of "Bro. Jones" about 1800 and was still standing in 1900 (170) which house was situated on lot No.27 and Tice's property included lot No.25. The sketch of survey of the township (171) reflects the distance to be 40 chains or 2640 feet. Gilbert Tice was, of course, deceased before that lodge was warranted about the year 1799.

Mrs. Tice's nephew David Bastedo, also known as Besteda, did, in fact, inherit Gilbert Tice's farm. On 23 June, 1796, Christina Tice and "David Besteda" (sic) petitioned the Council at York (later Toronto) as heirs of Gilbert Tice for a deed of 600 acres for lands set apart by Gilbert Tice's will for the payment of his debts which grant was so made. (172) Further, on October 7, 1796 the council then sitting at Newark received a further petition from Christina Tice stating that her late husband "the late Captain Gilbert Tice" had received only 1100 acres, and praying that the remaining 1900 acres be granted to her. It was ordered that Mrs. Tice's grant be made up to 3000 acres as it was Gilbert Tice's entitlement as a reduced captain. It was further referred to the Surveyor-General. (173) Christina Tice also received a further 600 acres from a petition which was read at Newark by the Council on 7 July, 1796. (174) This was in light of the Proclamation of John Graves Simcoe, the Lieutenant-Governor, dated at Quebec, 7th February, 1792, that specified that while a farm lot granted to any person should not contain more than two hundred acres, the Lieutenant-Governor or Person administering the Government could allot up to one thousand acres "as they may desire." (175) A Royal Proclamation in the absence of an elected assembly had been held to have the force of law. (176) It was a posthumous vote of thanks to Gilbert Tice for his many years of service to the Crown. It is a pity that the editors of the Dictionary of Canadian Biography did not see fit to include his name.

Christina Tice's nephew by marriage, David (Jacob) Bastedo, who was born in Schenectady in 1743, died at Stamford Township in 1829, having survived his wife Clarissa Jean Van Slyke by one year. They had a son whom they named Gilbert

Tice Bastedo and a grandson named Gilbert by his parents. (177)

Gilbert and Christina Tice were obviously far better off in Canada after the revolution than they had been in 1775 and so were several others who were Tory members of St. Patrick's Lodge whom we shall briefly observe. While it is difficult to establish the source of the American historical tradition which considered the Loyalists as losers, almost like a lost generation, it is entirely possible that the concept had its roots in the remarks of George Washington in March 1776 after the Loyalists had fled from Boston at the time of the British withdrawal. "One or two of them have done what a great many of them ought to have done long ago, committed suicide." To which he added "Unhappy wretches! Deluded mortals! Would it not be a good policy to grant a general amnesty, to conquer these people by a general forgiveness?" (178) While space does not permit a more detailed description of those Loyalists who lost the war and yet improved their positions in life, we must be content with a random sampling.

James Phyn and his partner Alexander Ellice were both admitted to the Degree of "Entred" (sic) Apprentices in St. Patrick's Lodge on Saturday, March 7, 1767. They were passed on Saturday, April 4. Bro. James Phyn was raised to the Sublime Degree of a Master Mason on Saturday, May 2, 1767 and Alexander Ellice was raised on Saturday, December 5, 1767. (179) They had no connection with Lt. George Phyn who was initiated into St. Patrick's Lodge on Saturday, 7 February, 1767. Lt. George Phyn was a regular officer of the British Army. Lt. Phyn was stationed at Fort Niagara in February 1765. (180) In December 1767 he was at Fort Chartres on the

Mississippi in the Illinois country (181) and on 15 April, 1768 he wrote to Sir William Johnson from Mobile in what is now Alabama. (182) At that time he was serving with the 34th Regiment and joined his unit at Pensacola, Florida under Brigadier-General Frederick Haldimand in the summer of 1767. (183) It would appear that he did not return to the Mohawk Valley.

James Phyn and Alexander Ellice were of a totally different type. Their aim was the accumulation of wealth and they pursued this goal with unswerving determination. James Phyn was born March 12, 1742 in Kent, England. (184) He was operating as a trader in Schenectady, New York as early as 24 February, 1764 as is evidenced by an account for clothing and shoes which he rendered to Sir William Johnson. (185) Alexander Ellice was born in Scotland in the parish of Auchterless, and was baptized 28 May, 1743. (186) Being the son of a prosperous miller, he attended Marischal College, University of Aberdeen and was called to the Scottish bar. (187) However, Ellice elected not to practice law and went with his four brothers to Schenectady, New York in 1765. (188) It was there that he entered into partnership with James Phyn early in 1766 forming the firm known as Phyn, Ellice and Company with Ellice contributing £714.11s.10d. as his initial investment. (189)

Johnson's books and records soon showed that the partners were able to tap the enormous trade with the Indians which Sir William Johnson controlled in his capacity as Superintendent of the Northern Department. (190) They did all of the right things which would incur Sir William's pleasure. They informed Sir William on 8 October, 1768 that they had sent him as a gift two casks of "first quality" port which

they had obtained from Lisbon.(191) Although they were both of Scottish descent, they joined St. George's Church in Schenectady which was Anglican. It was also financially supported by Sir William Johnson who had a pew there.(192) Phyn and Ellice rented a pew under their firm name and not individually as everyone else did.(193) They joined St. Patrick's Lodge in Johnstown where Sir William was master rather than Union Lodge in Albany, although Union Lodge was closer. Combined with that factor was the elevation in status that Freemasonry implied.

Rear Admiral Samuel Eliot Morison, himself a Mason, described the initiation of John Paul Jones in Scotland in 1770 as follows:

"This was a step upward for John Paul. Masonry enjoyed great repute in the United Kingdom, France and the British Colonies; members of the nobility and gentry, even royalty, belonged to it as well as professional men, merchants and shopkeepers. Any Freemason in good standing in his home lodge could attend meetings of any other lodge in the Empire and thereby meet prominent members of the community." (194)

All went well for Phyn and Ellice until the coming of the revolution in America. Immediately prior to the outbreak of hostilities, the partners circumvented the American embargo on the importation of British goods by causing their imports to be sent to Quebec and later to Montreal.(195) Following this, Phyn went to London to establish a London office in 1774 since the partners had concluded that their future in the fur trade lay with Britain.(196)

The Schenectady Committee of Correspondence

took note of the movements of Phyn and Ellice and Ellice's brothers. The meeting of the Schenectady Committee of Correspondence held in Schenectady 24 April, 1776, which included as a member Christopher Yates who had joined St. Patrick's Lodge on 1 August, 1767, (197) concluded that "Alexander Ellice who also went to England last fall, we know to be an open Enemy to the American Cause, for he harangued & discouraged the people in street last spring from Chusing a Committee, when they were met for that purpose." (198) However, Phyn and Ellice made the best of both worlds. While Phyn was in England in 1776, the partnership accounts in Schenectady were collected by Robert Ellice, Alexander's brother and a partner. (199) James Ellice, another Schenectady partner and brother of Alexander Ellice, took the American oath of allegiance and it was recorded in the minutes of the Schenectady Committee of Correspondence of May 19, 1779. (200) Thus, the firm through its Montreal and Schenectady branches furnished military supplies to, and acted as messengers and paymasters to both sides. (201) One is reminded of the words of the Vicar of Bray when charged with being a time-server he is said to have replied "Not so, neither, for if I changed my religion, I am sure I kept true to my principle, which is to live and die the vicar of Bray." Phyn and Ellice remained true to their principle which was to make a lot of money for themselves.

In 1777 Ellice's investment in the fur trade of about £42,300 was by far the largest of any trader in the colony of Quebec. (202) Between 1778 and 1783, the Montreal company received £28,233 for its services to the British forces. After the war Ellice moved into triangular trade involving America, the West Indies and Europe. Shares of ships were purchased and

leased and plantations in the West Indies were seized by Ellice for non-payment of debts. Between 1802 and 1807 the London office registered an annual gross balance in excess of £1,000,000. In 1795, Ellice purchased a signeury in Quebec commonly known as Beauharnois which measured 324 square miles for £9,000.(203) At the same time he maintained a residence in England. In 1803 Alexander Ellice retired from the partnership and died 25 September, 1805 in Bath, England and was buried in Bath Abbey on 5th October leaving an estate worth in excess of £450,000.(204) This was by far the greatest fortune which had been accumulated in British North America to that date. It exceeded by far the estate of Sir William Johnson whose fortune can be calculated by adding post-war claims of his chief beneficiaries, namely, Sir John Johnson, Guy Johnson and Daniel Claus. They were (based on their gross claims) Sir John Johnson, £103,182; Guy Johnson £22,140; and Daniel Claus £17,564. (205) This totalled £142,896 in claims which is far above what they were allowed. James Phyn died at Schenectady November 2, 1821 and was buried in Vale Cemetery.(206) Phyn and Ellice had demonstrated that there were qualifications to the term "winners and losers."

The scope of this paper does not permit us to examine in detail all of those Tories or Loyalists in St. Patrick's Lodge who were absolute winners in spite of the fact that there were a large number who were, in the final analysis, further ahead both financially and socially than they had been in 1775. The same holds true with those American brethren who supported the cause of Independence.

Peter W. Yates has been said to have become a member of St. Patrick's Lodge on 3 December

1772.(207) He was in fact master of Union Lodge No.1 in Albany in 1765. Bro. Peter W. Yates went on to become Senior Grand Warden of the State of New York from September 1, 1784 (208) until 4 April, 1789.(209)

Guy Johnson (1740-1788) and Christian Daniel Claus (1727-1787) were really the only two loyalist members of St. Patrick's Lodge whose lives were ruined by the War of the Revolution. Both of these men owed their positions in life to Sir William Johnson. Guy referred to Sir William as his uncle although his biographer suggests that their relationship was probably more distant.(210) However, Guy's elevation in status, like that of Daniel Claus, came from the fact that both men married the daughters of Sir William Johnson. Guy married Sir William's younger daughter Mary (Polly) in 1763 and Daniel Claus married Ann (Nancy) on 13 April, 1762.(211) On Sir William's death on 11 July, 1774, Guy Johnson and Daniel Claus became, after Sir William's son Sir John Johnson, the two most powerful and richest men in Tryon County.

The War of the Revolution seemed to bring out the worst and the best in all three men - Sir John Johnson, who had not even been self-supporting before his father's death, accounted himself fairly well during the war. In 1776 he raised the first battalion of the King's Royal Regiment of New York and in 1780 a second one. He was at the siege of Fort Stanwix under Sir Leger, commanded the British and Indian forces at Oriskany nearby in August 1777 and commanded raids into the Mohawk Valley in 1780, laying waste to the countryside and destroying vast quantities of grain and flour intended for use by the Continental Army.(212)

Guy Johnson did not account himself so well. The trip to England by Guy Johnson and Daniel Claus with their large party to protest against organizational changes in the Indian Department cost them dearly. The military establishment and the military men in government considered their absence which lasted from 11 November 1775(213) until 29 July, 1776(214) tantamount to mutiny.(215) Even the Privy Councilors in the Imperial government were unimpressed with Guy Johnson. From the very first, Lord George Germain disliked him and found him incompetent. Writing much later to Haldimand on August 8, 1780 he advised that Johnson's appointment was made for lack of anything better. (216) Guy Johnson's appearance and personality were also against him. He was described by an American prisoner as being "a short, pursy man ... of stern countenance and haughty demeanour - dressed in a British uniform, powdered locks, and a cocked hat. His voice was harsh, and his tongue bore evidence of his Irish extraction." (217)

Following his return to England in July 1776, Guy Johnson chose to remain behind the British lines in New York writing letters and despatches.(218) Thus, while John Butler carried the burden of the New York Border War out of Niagara, Guy Johnson, his commander, became the manager of the Theatre Royal, John St., New York and indeed acted in one of Colman's plays to raise money for military charity.(219) It was not until 17 July, 1779 that Guy Johnson reached Quebec and not until autumn that he reached Niagara.(220) On arrival Johnson exercised the perquisites of his office and immediately took over the handsome dwelling house within the walls of the fort which was an official residence of the Superintendent of Indians and known as the "House of Peace". Lt.Col. John

Butler, in consequence, moved across the river where he had constructed the area known today as "Butler's Barracks" which he called Butlersburg. (221) (222) It was a shoddy treatment of John Butler who had acted as de facto Superintendent while Guy Johnson had sat idly behind the lines for almost four years. Guy Johnson did little more after his arrival at Niagara.

At last, Sir Frederick Haldimand, the governor at Quebec had enough. He had observed the incompetency of Guy Johnson as well as the enormous expense of the upkeep of the Indian Department and the Indians and further, the unreliability of the Indians in the field. Finally, Guy Johnson was accused of collusion with contractors named Taylor and Forsythe who were trading at Niagara. Taylor and Forsythe coincidentally were close friends of Phyn and Ellice and their families. (223) A clerk in the employ of Taylor and Forsythe travelled to Quebec in September 1781 and revealed to the military authorities that Taylor and Forsythe had kept a double set of books, charging the government £35,000 for £27,000 worth which had been delivered. A hearing was held by the Court of Common Pleas at Quebec and Guy Johnson was ordered to attend. (224) Taylor and Forsythe were dismissed from their positions as sutlers and denied permission to trade at the upper posts. Guy Johnson repeatedly denied wrongdoing but evidence of collusion was strong. An inventory of the goods of the Indian Department showed a deficiency. (225) It was the end of Guy Johnson. Haldimand wrote to Lord George Germain on October 23, 1781 recommending the appointment of a "person of rank, influence, knowledge and perfect honour" to replace Guy Johnson. (226) He suggested Guy's brother-in-law, Sir John Johnson, would fulfil these requirements. It had escaped Haldimand's attention that the

person of "perfect honour" had, in fact in 1773, put aside his common-law wife, Clarissa Putman by whom he had two children, and married a New York socialite Mary Watts.(227) Honour, like beauty, was obviously in the eye of the beholder. The description of a "person of rank" was obviously calculated to snub a man like Lt.Col. John Butler. Butler, because of his obvious ability in dealing with the Indians, had previously made himself popular with both Carleton and Haldimand and, in turn, the object of jealousy by Guy Johnson and Claus, who sought to undermine his reputation.(228) Claus especially attacked Butler's respectability and continually in his letters described Butler as the "illiterate interpreter" and also described him as a man "that never was an Ensign in the Army, and was bred to the trade of saddler in New England." (229) Haldimand finally concluded even before the dismissal of Guy Johnson, that Butler was a man "deficient in Education and liberal Sentiments."(330) He thus passed over men like John Butler and selected Sir John Johnson.

Guy Johnson and Daniel Claus were both unhappy with the compensation awarded them by the Loyalist Claims Commission. Guy Johnson claimed a loss of £22,140 sterling and was awarded £6,690 sterling.(231) Daniel Claus claimed a loss of £17,564 sterling and received £6,435.(232) These sums which were paid came from complicated calculations which converted colonial currencies to sterling. (233) It also disallowed claims for bad debts, loss of expected profits, uncultivated land and property acquired during the war.(234) Both men went to England to seek redress of their grievances. Both were unsuccessful.

Guy Johnson died, it is said, in poverty and

"somewhat alcoholically" (235) in the Haymarket, London on March 5, 1788. On December 29 of that year, the council at Quebec granted his heirs one thousand acres on the south shore of the Ottawa river after being petitioned by his brother-in-law Sir John Johnson. (236) There is a memorial plaque in St. James, Piccadilly, London, England and his portrait by Benjamin West hangs in the National Gallery of Art, Washington D.C. (Andrew Mellon Collection). His restored American home, Guy Park Manor, stands on the north bank of the Mohawk river near Amsterdam, N.Y. and is now a museum. He was predeceased by his wife Mary (Polly) on 11 July 1775, and was survived by two daughters. (237)

Christian Daniel Claus died 9 November, 1787 near Cardiff, Wales. (238) Following his death, his wife Ann (Nancy), elder daughter of Sir William Johnson, returned to Canada and settled finally at Newark where she died in 1801. (239) Prior to this, in May 1788, she had been allowed a pension of £200 per annum which was her late husband's salary. It was recommended by her brother, Sir John Johnson. By a strange twist of fate both she and her son, Col. William Claus, were buried in the vault at Butler's Burial Ground. There the Claus family and the Butler family are buried together. (240) The "Illiterate interpreter" John Butler would have possibly have been amused had he lived to see it.

With peace, which finally came with the Treaty of Paris on 3 February, 1783, came the need for Americans to rebuild and for the Loyalists to continue to build. The Tory-Indian raids on the Mohawk Valley had taken their toll. It has been estimated that two thirds of the inhabitants were killed and that of the survivors 380 were widows with two thousand

fatherless children. Seven hundred buildings and fifty thousand bushels of wheat were destroyed. (241)

Nevertheless, the Patriot New Yorkers were resilient people. By 1792, a traveller from Massachusetts comparing the destruction that had been caused during the revolution was able to write "What a contrast now! Every house and barn rebuilt, the pastures crowded with cattle. Sheep & c. and the lap of Ceres full." (242) In 1775, Johnstown had boasted only Gilbert Tice's inn. By 1812, there were thirteen taverns in Johnstown and all of them prosperous. (243) In Schenectady the church-wardens of St. George's Church transferred Sir William Johnson's old canopied pew to Mrs. James Van Horne on August 2, 1800 "upon presentation of a claim in fee simple." (244) Mrs. James Van Horne was the former Margaret Putman, the illegitimate daughter of Sir John Johnson by Clarissa Putman whom he had cast aside to marry Mary Watts, the daughter of the president of the council of New York, Hon. John Watts. (245) This implied that she would not be obliged to pay pew rent. Clarissa Putman obviously had a difficult financial time since she had been turned out of Fort Johnson with her two children William and Margaret. She was forced to live on £50 annually in New York currency paid by Sir John. (246) It is interesting to note that this was only 25 per cent of the government pension which he had recommended for his sister Ann Claus. Johnson had not increased this amount even by 27 August 1816 (247) although he had been awarded £38,999 sterling from the Loyalist Claims Commission after the Revolution, (248) and he had income from his post as "Superintendent General and Inspector General of the Six Nations Indians and those in the Province of Quebec." He also had vast land holdings.

Sir John Johnson died at Montreal January 4, 1830 at his home and was buried at his country estate south of the St. Lawrence in the family burial vault at Mount Johnson, now Mont St. Gregoire. Two visits to that place by the writer in June 1966 revealed that the burial vault had been totally destroyed and in its place a motorized cistern was functioning beside an orchard. Sir John was unknown by the farmer who occupied the property. Propped against a fruit tree nearby was Sir John's headstone. His name had been chiselled from the stone but the remaining lines of engraving left no doubt as to his identity.

At St. Patrick's Lodge after the Revolution, on the night of the first meeting on Saturday 30 July, 1785, Zephaniah Batchelor, Gilbert Tice's son-in-law, took King Solomon's chair as Master. (249) It is interesting to note that while Batchelor had lived and worked in Johnstown prior to the Revolution he was never a member of St. Patrick's nor was he ever a visitor except that he had attended the Masonic funeral of Bro. Daniel Denniston at Johnstown on April 11, 1769 as a visitor from Ineffable Lodge and later as an occasional visitor. (250) Ineffable Lodge was a lodge of Perfection in Albany, New York which was chartered as Ineffable and Sublime Grand Lodge of Perfection on Sunday December 20, 1767. (251) The colonial minutes of the Ineffable Lodge of Perfection were long lost but recovered in 1901 and it was arranged that the Minutes from 1767 to 1774 be published in the Proceedings of the New York Council of Deliberation in 1902. (252) Those Minutes indicate that Bro. Zephaniah Batchelor (sic) was initiated at Albany 2 April, 1769. (253) Sir William Johnson was by Dispensation from the founder raised to the Sublime Degree of Perfection at Johnson Hall on 12 April, 1769

and paid the rather large subscription of 19/4.(254) Sir William never sat in the Inef-fable Lodge with Zephaniah Batchelor since Sir William did not attend any meetings at all after his installation. Sir William however fulfilled his promise to Dr. Peter Middleton, the Senior Grand Warden in his letter to Mid-dleton from Johnson Hall of June 28, 1766 when he said "I shall take care which I admit and in strict conformity to our seniors. There are but few people in the county who will answer the purpose..." (Italics mine).(255) This was in his capacity as Master of St. Patrick's Lodge.

His successors no doubt did precisely the same thing. It was a Tory dominated Lodge prior to 1775. In 1784 Batchelor served as an Assist-ant Justice in Tryon (now Montgomery) County. (256) He was also elected to serve as a Trustee of the Presbyterian Congregation of Johnstown along with Robert Adams, the new Warden of St. Patrick's, on 21 November, 1785.(257)

Crownage Kincaid was finally admitted to St. Patrick's Lodge at the same time on July 30, 1785(258) Kincaid, who was a farmer(259) in what is now Montgomery County was rejected by St, Patrick's Lodge on Thursday, March 1, 1770.(260) While it was, and is, contrary to Masonic jurisprudence, Kincaid appeared with others as a visitor to St. patrick's on July 30, 1785 and at that time made application to join the Lodge and was admitted.(261) Mackey points out that "a candidate, having been once reject-ed, can apply to no other Lodge for admission, except the one which had rejected him." (262) However, it was a new and democratic age in New York and it was obviously the wish of the Lodge to admit him as a member from another Lodge.

Crownage Kincaid had served in the Tryon

County Militia during the war. While it would appear that there is no record of him having served at the Battle of Oriskany in 1777, (263) he did serve under Captain, later Major, Jelles Fonda, a member of St. Patrick's Lodge since 7 March, 1771, (264) who was his Company Commander. (265)

Service in the Tryon County Militia even in wartime, did not imply full-time service. For example, in 1778 Kincaid's record of service reflects "6 days at Caughnawaga, 3 days at Caughnawaga, 3 days at Johnstown, 4 days at Cherry Valley, 8 days at Johnstown". (266) Kincaid's Battalion Commander was Col. Frederick Fisher (Visscher) (267) who was initiated into St. Patrick's Lodge on Thursday 7 May, 1772. (268) Both Jelles Fonda and Frederick Fisher served at Oriskany (269) and Fisher (Visscher) was wounded in action (270) commanding the rear guard. (271)

Both Jelles Fonda and Frederick Fisher suffered badly as a result of Tory-Indian raids into the Mohawk Valley. On May 22, 1780 a raiding party commanded by Sir John Johnson with five hundred Indians and Tories penetrated undetected into the neighbourhood of Johnstown and laid waste to the north side of the Mohawk River in the Caughnawaga District between Tribes Hill and a place called Anthony's Nose destroying a thirteen mile strip of the country except a few Tory homes. (272) Douw Fonda, the aged father of Jelles Fonda, lost his life. (273) In his old age, he had become childish and attempted to repel the raiders with his musket. As soon as the enemy arrived, he was led out of his house by a Mohawk Indian known as One-Armed Peter (he having lost his arm) toward the bank of the river where he was tomahawked and scalped. His murderer had often partaken of his

hospitality, having lived many years in the neighbourhood. (274) Jelles Fonda's own house which was elegantly furnished was looted and burned. (275) Frederick Fisher was scalped, and badly wounded but survived. (276). Two of his brothers were killed and scalped, his mother too feeble to make her escape was struck down but survived, and his house was burned down. (277) To the time of his death on June 9, 1809, he bore a broad scar upon his head, which, on public occasions, was covered by a silver plate made for the purpose. (278)

Not even all of the Tory-Loyalists applauded these barbaric attacks. Richard Cartwright, formerly of Albany, and Lt.Col. John Butler's secretary at Niagara from 1778-1780 who was a participant (279) wrote summing up the campaigns in general: "The cruelties that have attended it, and been exercised indiscriminately on friend and foe, without distinction of sex or age, when seriously considered, must make it be regarded with general abhorrence." He further described the repulsive characteristics of Indian warfare including the treatment of prisoners "stripped and beaten and treated with every kind of indignity by the Indians...their bodies treated in too indecent a manner to be described. (280)

In spite of everything, Jelles Fonda built a large new house, on the high ground in what is now the village of Fonda (281) in 1791, the year of his death on what is now Montgomery Terrace. (282) He became a judge of the old Tryon County and was a member of the New York State Assembly at the time of his passing. (283) Frederick Fisher (Visscher) was quite properly seated by George Washington on his right at a public dinner given in Schenectady in June, 1782 (284) and became a trustee of the new Johnstown Academy

in January 1794 as "a founder and benefactor." (285) He died at the age of sixty-nine on June 9, 1809 and he was buried in the family cemetery beside his murdered father and brothers overlooking the Mohawk Valley, three miles east of Fonda. (286) The family mansion from which he was buried, had been rebuilt "in a very spacious and solid manner" (287)

Finally, at an Extra meeting of St. Patrick's Lodge held on Saturday, June 29, 1831 it was recorded that:

"Whereas Sir John Johnson gave directions to have the old Provincial Warrant and Jewels of this Lodge to be delivered to the Master of this Lodge and Whereas the Worshipful Master has received the same by the direction of the said Sir John Johnson..." (288)

While there is no mention of the Warrant and Jewels in the Last Will and Testament of Sir John Johnson, which is dated 30 April, 1828 and filed for Probate on 17 August 1830, (289) we must take as best evidence the Minutes of St. Patrick's Lodge that Sir John Johnson was the cause of the return of the Warrant and the sterling silver jewels which Sir William Johnson had originally purchased from England.

Today, St. Patrick's Lodge not only has these items, but as well, the desk of Sir William Johnson, its first Master, and the Masonic apron of Colonel John Butler, which is in a state of excellent preservation. In this St. Patrick's has something in common with Niagara Lodge No.2 at Niagara-on-the-Lake, Ontario which has the Masonic apron worn by W. Bro. John Butler when he was Master there some time around 1787. Unfortunately, the early Minutes of Niagara Lodge (St. John's No.2 of Friend-

ship) have perished long ago by fire. (290) (291)

It is obvious that the conclusions which we must draw from this incomplete review of the personal histories of the fraternity of St. Patrick's Lodge demonstrate that not only in war but in life, there are winners and losers. Some, like Banyar, Phyn and Ellice were material winners but moral losers. By far the most, like Tice, Fonda and Fisher, were able to pick up the shattered pieces of their lives and surmount the difficulties with which life had presented them. A very few others, like Guy Johnson and Daniel Claus, were temperamentally unable to so do. They were the ones who spent the remainder of their days looking backwards over their shoulders and crying for what might have been. They lacked courage and resolve. However, in surveying these fragmentary glimpses of the past, we are inescapably obliged to subscribe to the conclusion of that great American writer William Faulkner, who in his acceptance speech of the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1949, said "I believe that man will not merely endure: he will prevail. He is immortal, not because he alone among creatures has an inexhaustible voice, but because he has a soul, a spirit capable of compassion and sacrifice and endurance." (292) It is a worthy observation. The members of St. Patrick's Lodge were largely apt students in the art of survival.

REFERENCES

1. Beacon Press, Boston, 1964, p.v.
2. Bernard Bailyn, The Ordeal of Thomas Hutchinson, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass. 1974, pp.383-408
3. Ray Allen Billington ed. Allan Nevins on History, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1975, p.188
4. The Papers of the Canadian Masonic Research Association 1949-1976, The Heritage Lodge, No.730, 1986, Vol.II p.1251
5. N.P., N.D.
6. Dougherty, Loyalists, Op.Cit. p.1255
7. William L. Stone, The Life and Times of Sir William Johnson, Bart., J. Munsell, Albany, 1865, Vol.II pp.376-379
8. Willard Sterne Randall, A Little Revenge: Benjamin Franklin and His Son, Little, Brown, Boston, Toronto, 1984, pp.59, 66-67. 102-103
9. Maryly B Penrose, Mohawk Valley in The Revolution: Committee of Safety Papers & Genealogical Compendium, Liberty Bell Associates, Franklin Park, New Jersey, 1978, p.1, Document 1
10. N.A. Sesquicentennial History: St. George's Lodge, N.P. Schenectady N.Y. September 1924, pp7-8
11. Penrose, Mohawk Valley, Op.Cit., Doc.3, p.4
12. The Papers of Sir William Johnson, The University of the State of New York, 14 Vols., Albany, 1921-1965, Vol.XII p.1063
13. Catherine Bryant Rowles, Tomahawks to Hatpins, North Country Books, 1975, End map showing location of store and house
14. Johnson Papers, Op.Cit. Vol.VIII p.114
15. Maryly B. Penrose, Indian Affairs Papers, American Revolution, Liberty Bell Associates, Franklin Park, New Jersey, 1981, p.155
16. Minutes, St. Patrick's Lodge, Thursday, 5 May 1774 and Thursday, 7 April 1774
17. Johnson Papers, Op.Cit. Vol.VII pp.855-848
18. Johnson Papers, Op.Cit. Vol.I pp.465-466, Commission 15 April 1755
19. Johnson Papers, Op.Cit. Vol.VII pp.844-848

20. Johnson Papers, Op.Cit. Vol.II p.X
21. William L. Stone, The Life and Times of Sir William Johnson, Bart., J. Munsell, Albany, 1865, Vol.II pp.492-501
22. Letter Daniel Claus to Lt. Gen. Frederick Haldimand 24 December 1778, printed in Penrose, Indian Affairs Papers, Op.Cit. pp.177-179
23. Penrose, Mohawk Valley, Op.Cit. Document 71, 10 June, 1779, p.118
24. Penrose, Indian Affairs, Op.Cit. p.191
25. Early History and Transactions of the Grand Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons of the State of New York, 1781-1815, Masonic and Miscellaneous Publishers, New York, 1876, pp.29-31, N.A. N.ed
26. Frances G. Halpenny, ed.Dictionary of Canadian Biography, Vol.VI 1821 to 1835 "Sir John Johnson" (Earle Thomas), University of Toronto Press, Toronto Buffalo London, 1987, p.353 (Herein after cited as D.C.B.)
27. Encyclopaedia Britannica 1958, Vol.3, "Baronet"
28. Sir Ivan De la Bere, The Queen's Orders of Chivalry, Spring Books, London, 1964, p.186 & p.47
29. Ibid. p.186
30. Phyllis R. Blakely and John N. Grand eds. Eleven Exiles: Accounts of Loyalists of the American Revolution "Sir John Johnson: Knight of the Revolution" (Mary Archibald), Dundurn Press Limited, Toronto and Charlottetown, 1932, p.200
31. Letter John Johnson to George Croghan 14 Dec, 1765, Johnson Papers, Op.Cit. Vol.XI p.979
32. Ibid. p.980
33. The Harmsworth Encyclopaedia, N.D., 8 Vols. London, c.1906, Vol.VII, "St. James's Palace"
34. Johnson Papers, Op.Cit. Vol.V pp.475-478, letter 26 January 1767, Sir William Johnson to Sir John Johnson
35. Charles T. McClenachan, History of the Most Ancient and Honourable Fraternity of Free And Accepted Masons in New York From The Earliest Date, 2 Vols., Grand Lodge, New York, 1886, Vol.I p.133
36. N.A. Grand Lodge: 1717-1967, University Press, Oxford, 1967, p.248 & p.272 and McClenachan, Op.Cit. p.133

37. Grand Lodge, Op.Cit. p.248 and McClenachan, Op.Cit. p.132
38. Ibid.
39. Grand Lodge, Op.Cit. p.272
40. Ibid p.248
41. Sesquicentennial History of St. George's Lodge, Op.Cit. p.7
42. Ibid and Lorenzo Sabine, Biographical Sketches of Loyalists of the American Revolution, 2 Vols., Genealogical Publishing Co. Inc., Baltimore, 1979, Vol.II p.79
43. McClenachan, Op.Cit. p.134
44. Ibid.
45. Dumas Malone, ed. Dictionary of American Biography, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1933, Vol.XII "Peter Middleton"
46. Ibid.
47. Concise Dictionary of American Biography, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1964, Vol. XII "Peter Middleton"
48. Johnson Papers, Op.Cit. Vol.I p.766
49. Johnson Papers, Op.Cit. Vol.IX pp.286-287 and p.295
50. Sabine, Op.Cit. Vol.II p.79
51. Gregory Palmer, Biographical Sketches of Loyalists of the American Revolution, Micklin Publishing, Westport, London, 1984, "Peter Middleton" p.603
52. Grand Lodge, Op.Cit. p.248
53. Sabine, Op.Cit. Vol.I p.206
54. New York (Colony) Council: Calendar of Council Minutes 1668-1783, Harbor Hill Books, Harrison, New York, 1987, p.343
55. Johnson Papers, Op.Cit. Vol.I pp.334-335
56. James Thomas Flexner, Mohawk Baronet: Sir William Johnson of New York, Harper & Bros., New York, 1969, p.113
57. Michael Kammen, Colonial New York: A History, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1975, p.301
58. Johnson Papers, Op.Cit. Vol.I pp.334-335
59. Sung Bok Kim, Landlord and Tenant in Colonial New York: Manorial Society, 1664-1774, University of North Carolina

Press, Chapel Hill, 1978, p.136

60. Randall, Op.Cit. pp.210-215 & p.217
61. Johnson Papers, Op.Cit. Vol.XIII p.277
62. Johnson Papers, Op.Cit. Vol.I p.334
63. E.B. O'Callaghan, ed. Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York, (hereinafter referred to N.Y.C.D.), Weed, Parsons And Company, Albany, 1857, Vol. VIII p.188
64. Kim, Op.Cit. p.352
65. Judge De Witt Gurnell, Rhinebeck New York: A Condensed History, N.P., N.D., p.2
66. William B. Willcox, Portrait of A General: Sir Henry Clinton in the War of Independence, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1962, p.188
67. N.Y.C.D., Vol. VIII p.188
68. N.Y.C.D., Vol. VIII, Ibid. p.189
69. Berthold Fernow, ed. Calendar of Wills, Albany 1626-1836, Genealogical Publishing Company, Baltimore, 1967, p.277 "Martha Mortier"
70. N.Y.C.D., Vol. VIII, Op.Cit. p.334
71. Rev. Laman H. Bruner, St. Peter's Church in the City of Albany: A Report Concerning The Founding of The Parish And Its Historical Treasures, N.P., N.D., N.P.
72. Ibid.
73. N.Y.C.D., Vol. VIII, Op.Cit. p.189
74. Sabine, Op.Cit. Vol.I p.206
75. N.Y.C.D., Op.Cit. Vol. VIII p.189
76. E.B. O'Callaghan, ed. The Documentary History of the State of New York, Weed, Parsons & Co., Albany, 1850, Vol.III p. 1155 (4 Vols. hereinafter cited as D.H.N.Y.)
77. Sabine, Vol.I, Op.Cit. p.206
78. Ibid.
79. Laws of the State of New York I:173-84
80. Section I

81. Section IX
82. P. Asterley Jones and J.C. Fisher, eds. Mozley and Whiteley's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, Butterworth & Co., London, 1950, "Attainder"
83. G.R. Elton, England under the Tudors, Methuen & Co., London, 1962, p.158
84. Section I
85. Section I
86. Section I
87. Minutes, St. Patrick's Lodge
88. Edward D. O'Neill, Historical Events of the City of Johnstown, N.Y. 1755-1931, N.P., N.D., Johnstown, N.Y., N.P.
89. Flexner, Op.Cit. p.301
90. Ibid. 302
91. Penrose, Mohawk Valley, Op.Cit. p.343
92. Johnson Papers, Op.Cit., Vol.Viii p.105
93. The Old United Empire Loyalists List, Genealogical Publishing Company, Baltimore, 1969,p.270
94. Penrose, Mohawk Valley, Op.Cit. p.127
95. D.C.B., Vol.IV "John Butler" (R. Arthur Bowler and Bruce G. Wilson)
96. Catherine Bryant Rowles, Tomahawks to Hatpins, North County Books, Lakemount, N.Y., 1975, p.41
97. The Papers of the Canadian Masonic Research Association, Heritage Lodge, 1986, Vol.II p.1255 "Loyalist Masons of the Mohawk Valley" (E.F. Dougherty). The word "possibly" is used deliberately by this writer since the authorities quoted by Dougherty are erroneous. Dougherty intended to say Ontario Historical Society Papers and Records Vol. XXV, Toronto, 1925, p.186 and Ontario Historical Society, Papers and Records Vol,XXI, Toronto, 1924 p.326. These are papers which deal with Gilbert Tice but do not mention his place and date of birth. Dougherty must have obtained the information elsewhere and later became confused as to his sources when he compiled his References. The volume numbers and page numbers cited, together with a computer search at the Metropolitan Toronto Reference Library on 21 December 1987 lead us to this conclusion.

98. Jonathan Pearson, Contributions for the Genealogies of The Descendants of the First Settler's of the Patent and City of Schenectady from 1662 to 1800, J. Munsell, Albany, 1873, p.240
99. Ibid. p.204
100. Ibid.
101. Ontario. Historical Society Papers and Records, XXI (1924) "Gilbert Tice, U.E." (Ernest Green), p.187
102. Calendar of Council Minutes 1668-1783, Op.Cit. p.534
103. Ibid pp.538-539
104. Ibid p.540
105. Minutes, St. Patrick's Lodge
106. Ernest Cruikshank, The Story of Butler's Rangers and the Settlement of Niagara, Tribune Printing House, Welland, Ont., 1893, p.8
107. Green, Op.Cit. pp.187-188
108. Johnson Papers, Op.Cit. Vol.VII pp.699-710
109. St. Patrick's Lodge, Minutes
110. 32 & 33 Vict. c.62
111. Division of Archives and History, The American Revolution in New York: Its Political, Social and Economic Significance. The University of the State of New York, Albany, 1926, p.236
112. Lawrence M. Friedman, A History of American Law, Simon and Schuster, New York, 1973, p.259
113. N.Y.C.D., Op.Cit. Vol.VI p.226
114. Johnson Papers, Vol.VIII pp.360-362
115. Ibid. pp.370-371
116. Ibid. p.378
117. John J. Vrooman, Forts and Firesides of the Mohawk Country, Baronet Litho Co. Inc., Johnstown, N.Y., 1961, pp.113-117
118. Johnson Papers, Op.Cit. Vol.VIII p.404
119. e.g. Green and Dougherty
120. Johnson Papers, Ibid, Vol.Xii pp.1025-1026

121. Johnson Papers, Op.Cit. Vol. IV p.347
122. N.Y.C.D., Vol.VIII p.661
123. Isabel Thompson Kelsay, Joseph Brant 1743-1807: Man of Two Worlds, Syracuse University Press, Syracuse, N.Y., 1984, p.160
124. N.Y.C.D. Vol. I p.636, letter Guy Johnson to Dartmouth, October 12, 1775
125. Howard Swiggett, War Out of Niagara, Ira J. Friedman, Port Washington, New York, 1963, p.65 (First printed 1933) Columbia University Press
126. For the full story of this hoax see Richmond P. Bond, Queen Anne's American Kings, Oxford, 1952
127. Act II, Sc.2 L.32
128. See, as well, Benjamin Bissel, The American Indian In English Literature Of The Eighteenth Century, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1925, p.56, f.6
129. Charles Ryscamp and Frederick A. Pottle, eds. Boswell: The Ominous Years, 1774-1776, The Yale Editions of the Private Papers of James Boswell, McGraw Hill, New York, 1963, pp.341-342
130. Geoffrey Scott and Frederick A. Pottle, eds. The Private Papers of James Boswell from Malahide Castle, W.E. Rudge (privately Printed), Mount Vernon, N.Y., 1928-1934 (18 vols.) Vol.II (1931) p.258
131. Christopher Ward, The War of the Revolution, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1952, Vol.I pp.151-152
132. Ibid. p 152
133. Ibid.
134. Kelsay, Op.Cit. p.163 & p.165
135. William Ketchum, History of Buffalo, Rockwell, Baker & Hill, Buffalo, N.Y., 1864, Vol. I p.256
136. Green, Ontario Historical Society Papers and Records, Op.Cit. p.190
137. Ibid.
138. Ibid.
139. Ibid. p.191
140. Ibid. p.192

141. Jane Errington, The Lion, The Eagle and Upper Canada: A Developing Colonial Ideology, McGill-Queens University Press, Kingston and Montreal, 1987, p.5
142. Ibid. p.3
143. The Old United Empire Loyalists List, Op.Cit., Appendix B p.265
144. John Leslie, The Treaty of Amity, Commerce and Navigation, 1794-1796 (The Jay Treaty), Department of Indian and Northern affairs, Canada, Ottawa, 1983, p.2
145. Johnson Papers, Op.Cit. Vol. VI p.732 & p.757
146. Penrose, Mohawk Valley In The Revolution, Op.Cit. p.224
147. Minutes, St. Patrick's Lodge, Saturday, July 30, 1785
148. Land Registry Office, Welland, (Stamford), Book A, Page 253, Registry No. 6131
149. Penrose, Mohawk Valley, Op.Cit. p.224
150. Ibid.
151. Arthur R.M. Lower, Colony To Nation: A History of Canada, Longman's Green & Co., Toronto. London. New York, 1946, p.119
152. R. Scott Stephenson, Famous Illnesses in History, "The Insanity of George III", Eyre & Spottiswoode, London, 1962, p.169 and see, as well, Charles Chenevix Trench, The Royal Malady, Longmans, Green and Co. Ltd., London 1964
153. Rt.Hon. Sir George Otto Trevelyan, The American Revolution, Part 1, 1766-1776, Longman's, Green and Co., London, New York and Bombay, 1899, p.258
154. Stephenson, Op.Cit. p.169
155. Ontario Historical Society Papers and Records, Vol.XXV, Toronto, 1928, (Ernest Green) "Township No.,2 - Mount Dorchester-Stamford" p.326
156. Mary Quale Innis, ed., Mrs. Simcoe's Diary, Macmillan of Canada, Toronto, 1965, p.99
157. Ibid. p.160
158. Ibid. p.167
159. Ibid. p.165
160. Ibid.

161. Elise Lathrop, Early American Inns and Taverns, Tudor Publishing Co., New York, 1937, p.254
162. Edwin C. Guillet, Early Life In Upper Canada, The Ontario Publishing Co. Ltd., Toronto, 1933, p.220
163. Innis, Op.Cit., p.7
164. E.A. Cruikshank, ed., Records of Niagara 1784-7, No.39, Niagara Historical Society, N.D., pp.118-119
165. Green, Op.Cit., pp.192-193
166. Frederick H. Armstrong, Handbook of Upper Canadian Chronology, (Revised Edition), Dundurn Press, Toronto and London, 1985, p.117
167. Alexander Fraser, Seventeenth Report of the Department of Public Records and Archives of Ontario, 1928, King's Printer, Toronto, 1929, p.160
168. E.A. Cruikshank, Records of Niagara 1790-92, No.41, Niagara Historical Society, 1930, pp21-22
169. Janet Carnochan, History of Niagara, Mika Publishing, Belleville, Ontario, 1973, p.9
170. John Ross Robertson, The History of Freemasonry in Canada, J. Ross Robertson, Toronto, 1900, Vol.I pp.693-698
171. Certified true copy from Crown Lands Department, Montreal, August 1846
172. Alexander Fraser, Twentieth Report of the Department of Public Records and Archives of Ontario, 1931, King's Printer, Toronto 1932, p.171
173. Alexander Fraser, Nineteenth Report of the Department of Public Records and Archives of Ontario, 1930, King's Printer, Toronto 1931, p.8
174. Ibid. p.17
175. E.A. Cruikshank, ed., The Correspondence of Lieut. Governor John Graves Simcoe, Vol.I, 1789-1793, The Ontario Historical Society, Toronto, 1923, pp.108-109
176. Campbell V Hall (1774) Cowp.204
177. Toronto Branch, The United Empire Loyalists' Association of Canada, Loyalist Lineages of Canada 1783-1984, Generation Press, Agincourt, Ont., 1984, p.40, "Bastido"
178. James THomas Flexner, Washington: The Indispensable Man, New American Library, A Signet Book, New York, 1984, p.75

179. Minutes, St. Patrick's Lodge
180. Johnson Papers, Op.Cit., Vol.IV p.650
181. Johnson Papers, Vol.VI, Op.Cit. p.21
182. Ibid. pp.193-197
183. Johnson Papers, Op.Cit., Vol.V pp.562-563
184. Willis T. Hanson, A History of Schenectady During the Revolution, Privately Printed, Schenectady, 1916, p.202
185. Johnson Papers, Op.Cit., Vol.XI pp.78-79
186. D.C.B., Vol.V, "Alexander Ellice" (James M. Colthart)
187. Ibid.
188. Ibid.
189. Ibid.
190. Johnson Papers, Op.Cit., Vol.Vii p.556-557, Vol.XII pp.605, 901, 946, 1002.
191. Johnson Papers, Vol.XII pp.604-605
192. Willis T. Hanson, A History of St. George's Church in the City of Schenectady, Privately Printed, 1919, Vol.I pp.44,47,31
193. Ibid. Vol.I p.47
194. Samuel Eliot Morrison, John Paul Jones: A Sailor's Biography, Little, Brown and Company, Boston Toronto, 1959, p.20
195. D.C.B., Vol.V Op.Cit. "Alexander Ellice"
196. Ibid.
197. Minutes, St. Patrick's Lodge, Saturday, 1 August, 1767
198. Minutes of the Schenectady Committee 1775-1779, Vol.II, University of the State of New York, Albany, 1925, pp.1065-1066
188. Hanson, Schenectady Op.Cit. p.202
200. Vrooman, Op.Cit. p.87
201. D.C.B., Vol.V Op.Cit. "Alexander Ellice"
202. Ibid.
- 203 Ibid.

204. Ibid.
205. Gregory Palmer, Biographical Sketches of Loyalists of the American Revolution, Meckler Publishing, Westport, London, 1984, pp.438, 437, 159
206. Hanson, Schenectady, Op.Cit., p.202
207. Bro. E.F. Dougherty, in The Papers of The Canadian Masonic Research Association, Vol.II p.1254 states this is a fact. A review of the Minutes of St. Patrick's Lodge for Thursday, 3 December 1772 does not reveal the presence or name of Peter W. Yates at all. Nevertheless, subsequent meetings of the Lodge on 27 December 1772, 11 February 1773, 3 February 1774, 3 March 1774, 7 April 1774 and 5 May 1774 show Bro. Peter W. Yates to have been absent! Bro. E.F. Dougherty is deceased. However, the date of 3 December 1772 for the initiation of Bro. Dougherty. Inasmuch as Peter W. Yates was a resident of Albany and Master of Union Lodge No.1 as of 1765, it is clear that Peter W. Yates was only a visitor and not a member of St. Patrick's Lodge. See Charles T. McClenachan, Op.Cit., Vol.I p.175
208. McClenachan, Vol.II p.34
209. Ibid. Vol.II p.53
210. D.C.B., Vol.IV, 1979, "Guy Johnson" (Jonathan G. Rossie)
211. D.C.B., Vol.IV, "Christian Daniel Claus" (Douglas Leighton)
212. D.C.B., Vol.VI, 1987 "Sir John Johnson" (Earl Thomas)
213. Kelsay, Op.Cit., p.160
214. Ibid. p.175
215. Ontario Historical Society, Ontario History, Vol.LXVIII, Sept. 1979, No.3 (Bruce Wilson) "The Struggle for Wealth and Power at Fort Niagara 1775-1783" p.141
216. Kelsay, Op.Cit., p.167
217. William L. Stone, Life of Joseph Brant - Thayendanegea, 2 Vols., Alexander V. Blake, New York, 1838, Vol.II p.67
218. Ketchum, Op.Cit., Vol.I p.269,271
219. The Dictionary of National Biography, Vol.X "Guy Johnson" p.901
220. D.C.B., Vol.IV "Guy Johnson"
221. D.C.B., Vol.IV, Op.Cit. "John Butler" (R. Arthur Bowler and Bruce G. Wilson) p.119

222. Robert B. Roberts, New York's Forts in the Revolution, Associated University Presses, London and Toronto, 1980, pp.358-359
223. D.C.B., Vol.V, Op.Cit. "Alexander Ellice" (James M. Cothart) p.299
224. Ontario History, Op.Cit. (Bruce Wilson) "The Struggle for Wealth and Power at Fort Niagara, 1774-1783", p.146
225. Ibid.
226. Canadian Public Archives Report, 1885, p.341
227. D.C.B., Vol. VI, Op.Cit. "Sir John Johnson", p.352
228. D.C.B., Vol. IV, Op.Cit. "John Butler", p.120
229. Ontario History, Op.Cit. (Bruce Wilson) "The Struggle for Wealth and Power at For Niagara", p.142
230. Ibid. p.147
231. Palmer, Op.Cit., p.437
232. Ibid. p.159
233. Ibid. p.XXIV
234. Ibid. p.XIII
235. Flexner, Mohawk Baronet, Op.Cit., p.352
236. Alexander Fraser, Third Report of the Bureau of Archives for the Province of Ontario, 1905, King's Printer, Toronto, 1906, p.413-414
237. D.C.B., Vol IV, Op.Cit. "Guy Johnson", p.394
238. Ibid. "Christian Daniel Claus", p.154
239. Sabine, Op.Cit. Vol.I p.318
240. Carnohan, Op.Cit. pp.178-179
241. Flexner, Mohawk Baronet, Op.Cit. p.351
242. D.H.N.Y., Vol.II, Op.Cit. p.1105
243. Lathrop, Op.Cit., p.255
244. Willis T. Hanson, Jr., A History of St. George's Church In The City of Schenectady, Op.Cit., Vol.I, p.107
245. Phyllis R. Blakely and John N. Grant, eds., Eleven Exiles: Accounts of Loyalists of the American Revolution, "Sir John

Johnson of Johnson Hall: Knight of the Revolution", (Mary Archibald) p.202 & p.219

- 246. Ibid. p.220
- 247. Ibid. p.221
- 248. Palmer, Op.Cit., p.438
- 249. Minutes, St. Patrick's Lodge, Saturday July 30, 1785
- 250. Minutes, St. Patrick's Lodge, Johns Town, Tuesday April 11 1769
- 251. David T. Urband, Ancient Accepted Scottish Rite, Valley of Albany, New York, 1979, Masonic Temple, ALbany, New York, pp.7-8
- 252. Ibid. p.8
- 253. Proceedings of the Thirty-Third Council of Deliberation for the Bodies Of The Ancient Accepted Scottish Rite Northern Masonic Jurisdiction, USA of the State of New York, Printed By Order Of The Council, 1902, p.170
- 254. Ibid.
- 255. Johnson Papers, Vol.V, Op.Cit. p.286
- 256. Penrose, Mohawk Valley, Op.Cit., p.224
- 257. Maryly B. Penrose, Mohawk Valley Land Records: Abstracts 1738-1788, Liberty Bell Associates, Franklin Park, New Jersey, 1985, p.75
- 258. Minutes, St. Patrick's Lodge
- 259. Penrose, Land Records, Op.Cit., p.55
- 260. Minutes, St. Patrick's Lodge, 1 March 1770
- 261. Minutes, St. Patrick's Lodge, July 30, 1785
- 262. Albert G. Mackey, Jurisprudence of Freemasonry, Charles T. Pawner Co., Chicago, Illinois, 1975, p.94
- 263. Edwin Vogt, Forty Miles to Freedom, Mohawk Valley Classics, Little Falls, New York, 1981, Roster of Tryon County Militia, p.25
- 264. Minutes, St. Patrick's Lodge, 7 March 1771
- 265. N.A. History of Montgomery and Fulton Counties, N.Y., F.W. Beers & Co., New York, 1878, (Reproduced by Heart Of The Lakes Publishing, Interlaken, N.Y., 1981, p.38

266. Ibid.
267. Penrose, Mohawk Valley Land Records, Op.Cit., p.13
268. Minutes, St. Patrick's Lodge, 7 May 1772
269. Vogt, Op.Cit., p.28 & p.30
270. Ibid. p.30
271. Barbara Graymont, The Iroquois in the American Revolution, Syracuse University Press, Syracuse, N.Y., 1972, p.134
272. Ibid. p.233
273. Ibid.
274. History of Montgomery and Fulton Counties, Op.Cit. p.137
275. Ibid. p.138
276. Graymont, Op.Cit., p.233
277. Hanson, Schenectady, Op.Cit. p.96
278. Vrooman, Op.Cit., pp.176-179
279. D.C.B., Vol.V, Op.Cit., "Richard Cartwright" (George Rawlyk and Janice Potter) p.168
280. The Ontario Department of Public Records And Archives, Three History Theses, Toronto, 1961, (Donald C. MacDonald), "Honourable Richard Cartwright, 1759-1815", M.A. Thesis, Queen's University, 1939, p.10. Incidentally, Donald C. MacDonald later sat in the Ontario Legislature.
281. History of Montgomery and Fulton Counties, Op. Cit., p.138
282. Nelson Greene, The Old Mohawk Turnpike Book, The Mohawk Valley Historic Association, Inc., Nelson Greene, Fort Plain, New York, 1924, p.106 & p.108
283. History of Montgomery and Fulton Counties, Op.Cit., p.138
284. Hanson, Schenectady, Op.Cit., pp.121-122
285. History of Montgomery and Fulton Counties, Op.Cit., p.197
286. Ibid. p.149
287. Ibid.
288. Minutes, St. Patrick's Lodge, Saturday, June 29, 1831
289. Archives Nationales Du Quebec, Montreal, Probate No. 168, 17 August, 1830

290. Carnochan, Op.Cit., pp.120-127

291. For full story of John Butler see The Papers of the Canadian Masonic Research Association, Vol.II, Heritage Lodge No. 730, 1986 "Colonel John Butler", (RW.Bro. Wm. M. MacDonald), pp.1303-1328

292. Nobel Prize Library, William Faulkner, Eugene O'Neill, John Steinbeck, Published Under the Sponsorship of The Nobel Foundation & The Swedish Academy, Alexis Gregory, New York and CRM Publishing, Del Mar, California, 1971, p.8

BIBLIOGRAPY

Frederick H. Armstrong, Handbook of Upper Canadian Chronology (Revised Edition), Dundurn Press, Toronto and London, 1985

Bernard Bailyn, The Ordeal of Thomas Hutchinson, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass. 1974

Ray Allen Billington ed. Allan Nevins on History, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1975

Benjamin Bissel, The American Indian In English Literature Of The Eighteenth Century, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1925

Phyllis R. Blakely and John N. Grant eds. Eleven Exiles: Accounts of Loyalists of the American Revolution "Sir John Johnson: Knight of the Revolution" (Mary Archibald), Dundurn Press Limited, Toronto and Charlottetown, 1982

Sir Ivan De la Bere, The Queen's Orders of Chivalry, Spring Books, London, 1964

Richmond P. Bond, Queen Anne's American Kings, Oxford, 1952

Rev. Laman H. Bruner, St. Peter's Church in the City of Albany: A Report Concerning The Founding of The Parish And Its Historical Treasures, N.P., N.D.,

Janet Carnochan, History of Niagara, Mika Publishing, Belleville, Ontario, 1973 (originally published William Briggs, Toronto, 1914)

E.A. Cruikshank, ed., The Correspondence of Lieut. Governor John Graves Simcoe, Vol.I, 1789-1793, The Ontario Historical Society, Toronto, 1923

E.A. Cruikshank, ed., Records of Niagara 1784-7, No.39, Niagara Historical Society, N.D.

E.A. Cruikshank, Records of Niagara 1790-92, No.41, Niagara Historical Society, 1930

Ernest Cruikshank, The Story of Butler's Rangers and the Settle-

ment of Niagara, Tribune Printing House, Welland, Ont., 1893

G.R. Elton, England under the Tudors, Methuen & Co., London, 1962

Jane Errington, The Lion, The Eagle and Upper Canada: A Developing Colonial Ideology, McGill-Queens University Press, Kingston and Montreal. 1987

Berthold Fernow, ed. Calendar of Wills, Albany 1626-1836, Genealogical Publishing Company, Baltimore, 1967

James Thomas Flexner, Mohawk Baronet: Sir William Johnson of New York, Harper & Bros., New York, 1969

James Thomas Flexner, Washington: The Indispensable Man, New American Library, A Signet Book, New York, 1984

Alexander Fraser, Third Report of the Bureau of Archives for the Province of Ontario, 1905, King's Printer, Toronto, 1906

Alexander Fraser, Seventeenth Report of the Department of Public Records and Archives of Ontario, 1928, King's Printer, Toronto, 1929

Alexander Fraser, Nineteenth Report of the Department of Public Records and Archives of Ontario, 1928, King's Printer, Toronto, 1931

Alexander Fraser, Twentieth Report of the Department of Public Records and Archives of Ontario, 1931, King's Printer, Toronto 1932

Lawrence M. Friedmand, A History of American Law, Simon and Schuster, New York, 1973

Edwin C. Guillet, Early Life In Upper Canada, The Ontario Publishing Co. Ltd., Toronto, 1933

Barbara Graymont, The Iroquois in the American Revolution, Syracuse University Press, Syracuse, N.Y., 1972

Nelson Greene, The Old Mohawk Turnpike Book, The Mohawk Valley Historic Association, Inc., Nelson Greene, Fort Plain, New York, 1924

Judge De Witt Gurnell, Rhinebeck New York: A Condensed History, N.P., N.D.

Frances Halpenny, ed. Dictionary of Canadian Biography, Vol.VI 1821 to 1835 "Sir John Johnson" (Earle Thomas), University of Toronto Press, Toronto Buffalo London, 1987

Willis T. Hanson, Jr., A History of St. George's Church In The City of Schenectady, Privately Printed, Schenectady, 1919

Willis T. Hanson, A History of Schenectady During The Revolution,

Privately Printed, Schenectady, 1916

Mary Quayle Innes, ed., Mrs. Simcoe's Diary, MacMillan of Canada, Toronto, 1965

P. Asterley Jones and J.C. Fisher, eds. Mozley And Whiteley's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, Butterworth & Co., London, 1950, "Attainder"

Michael Kammen, Colonial New York: A History, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1975

Isabel Thompson Kelsay, Joseph Brant 1743-1807: Man of Two Worlds, Syracuse University Press, Syracuse, N.Y., 1984

Sung Bok Kim, Landlord and Tenant in Colonial New York: Manorial Society, 1664-1774, University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 1978

William Ketchum, History of Buffalo, Rockwell, Baker & Hill, Buffalo, NY, 1864

Elise Lathrop, Early American Inns and Taverns, Tudor Publishing Co., New York, 1937

John Leslie, The Treaty of Amity, Commerce and Navigation, 1794-1796 (The Jay Treaty), Department of Indian and Northern Affairs, Canada, Ottawa, 1983

Arthur R. M. Lower, Colony To Nation: A History of Canada, Longman's Green & Co., Toronto, London. New. York, 1946

Albert G. Mackey, Jurisprudence of Freemasonry, Charles T. Pawner Co., Chicago, Illinois, 1975

Dumas Malone ed. Dictionary of American Biography, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1933, VOL.XII "Peter Middleton"

Charles T. McClenachan, History of the Most Ancient And Honourable Fraternity of Free And Accepted Masons in New York From The Earliest Date. 2 Vols., Grand Lodge, New York, 1886

Samuel Eliot Morrison, John Paul Jones: A Sailor's Biography, Little, Brown and Company, Boston Toronto, 1959

E.B. O'Callaghan, ed. Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York, Weed, Parsons And Company, Albany, 1857

E.B. O'Callaghan, ed. The Documentary History of the State of New York, Weed, Parsons & Co., Albany, 1850

Edward D. O'Neil, Historical Events of the City of Johnstown, N.Y. 1755-1931, N.P., N.D., Johnstown, N.Y., c.1931

Gregory Palmer, Biographical Sketches of Loyalists of the American

Revolution, Micklin Publishing, Westport, London, 1984

Jonathan Pearson, Contributions for the Genealogies of The Descendants of The First Settlers of the Patent And City of Schenectady from 1662 to 1800, J. Munsell, Albany, 1873

Maryly B. Penrose, Mohawk Valley In The Revolution: Committee of Safety Papers & Genealogical Compendium, Liberty Bell Associates, Franklin Park, New Jersey, 1978

Maryly B. Penrose, Mohawk Valley Land Records: Abstracts 1738-1788. Liberty Bell Associates. Franklin Park, New Jersey, 1985

Maryly B. Penrose, Indian Affairs Papers, American Revolution, Liberty Bell Associates, Franklin Park, New Jersey, 1981

Willard Sterne Randall, A Little Revenge: Benjamin Franklin And His Son, Little, Brown and Company, Boston Toronto, 1984

Robert B. Roberts, New York's Forts in the Revolution, Associated University Presses, London and Toronto, 1980

John Ross Robertson, The History of Freemasonry in Canada, 2 Vols., J. Ross Robertson, Toronto, 1900

Catherine Bryant Rowles, Tomahawks to Hatpins, North County Books, Lakemount, N.Y., 1975

Charles Ryscamp and Frederick A. Pottle, eds. Boswell: The Ominous Years, 1774-1776, The Yale Editions of the Private Papers of James Boswell, McGraw Hill, New York, 1963

Lorenzo Sabine, Biographical Sketches of Loyalists of the American Revolution, 2 Vols., Genealogical Publishing Co. Inc., Baltimore, 1979

Geoffrey Scott and Frederick A. Pottle, eds. The Private Papers of James Boswell from Malahide Castle, W.E. Rudge (Privately Printed), Mount Vernon, N.Y., 1928-1934

R. Scott Stephenson, Famous Illnesses in History, "The Insanity of George III", Eyre & Spottiswoode, London, 1962

William L. Stone, The Life and Times of Sir William Johnson, Bart., J. Munsell, Albany, 1865

William L. Stone, Life of Joseph Brant - Thayendanegea, 2 Vols., Alexander V. Blake, New York, 1838

Howard Swiggett, War Out of Niagara, Ira J. Friedman, Port Washington, New York, 1963 (First printed 1933 Columbia University Press)

Charles Chenevix Trench, The Royal Malady, Longmans, Green and Co. Ltd., London, 1964

Rt.Hon. Sir George Otto Trevelyan, The American Revolution, Part

I, 1766-1776, Longman's Green and Co., London, New York and Bombay, 1899

David T. Urband, Ancient Accepted Scottish Rite, Valley of Albany, New York, 1979, Masonic Temple, Albany, New York

Edwin Vogt, Forty Miles to Freedom, Mohawk Valley Classics, Little Falls, New York, 1981, Roster of Tryon County Militia, p.25

John J. Vrooman, Forts and Firesides of the Mohawk County, Baronet Litho Co. Inc., Johnstown, N.Y. 1961

Christopher Ward, The War of the Revolution, 2 Vols., The MacMillan Company, New York, 1952

William B. Willcox, Portrait of A General: Sir Henry Clinton in the War of Independence, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1962

Archives Nationales Du Quebec, Montreal, Probate No.168, 17 August, 1830

Canadian Public Archives Report, 1885

Concise Dictionary of American Biography, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1964

The Dictionary of National Biography

Division of Archives and History, The American Revolution in New York: Its Political, Social and Economic Significance, The University of the State of New York, Albany, 1926

Early History and Transactions of the Grand Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons of the State of New York, 1781-1815, Masonic and Miscellaneous Publishers, New York, 1876

Encyclopaedia Britannica 1958

Grand Lodge: 1717-1967, University Press, Oxford, 1967

The Harmsworth Encyclopaedia, N.D., 8 Vols. London, c.1906

History of Montgomery and Fulton Counties, N.Y., F.W. Beers & Co. New York, 1878, (Reproduced by Heart of The Lakes Publishing, Interlaken, N.Y., 1981

Laws of the State of New York I:173-84

Toronto Branch, The United Empire Loyalists' Association of Canada, Loyalist Lineages of Canada, 1783-1983, Generation Press, Agincourt, Ont., 1984

Minutes, St. Patrick's Lodge, Johnstown, N.Y. (unpublished)

Minutes of the Schenectady Committee 1775-1779, Vol.II, University of the State of New York, Albany, 1925

New York (Colony) Council: Calendar of Council Minutes 1668-1783,
Harbor Hill Books, Harrison, New York, 1987

Nobel Prize Library, William Faulkner, Eugene O'Neill, John Stein-
beck, Published Under the Sponsorship of The Nobel Foundation & The
Swedish Academy, Alexis Gregory, New York and CRM Publishing, Del
Mar, California 1971

The Old United Empire Loyalists List, Genealogical Publishing
Company, Baltimore, 1969

Ontario Historical Society Papers and Records Vol.XXV, Toronto,
1925

Ontario Historical Society, Papers and Records Vol.XXI, Toronto,
1924

Ontario Historical Society, Ontario History, Vol.LXVIII, Sept
1976, No.3 (Bruce Wilson) "The Struggle for Wealth and Power at
Fort Niagara 1775-1783"

The Papers of The Canadian Masonic Research Association 1949-1976,
3 Vols., The Heritage Lodge, No. 730, 1986

The Papers of Sir William Johnson, The University of the State of
New York, Albany, 14 Vols., 1921-1965

Proceedings of the Thirty-Third Council of Deliberation for the
Bodies of The Ancient Accepted Scottish Rite Northern Masonic
Jurisdiction, USA of the State of New York, Printed By Order Of The
Council, 1902

Sesquicentennial History, St. George's Lodge, N.P. Schenectady
N.Y. September 1924

The Ontario Department of Public Records And Archives, Three
History Theses. Toronto, 1961, (Donald C. MacDonald), "Honourable
Richard Cartwright, 1759-1815", M.A. Thesis, Queen's University,
1939

**REVIEWS OF THE PAPER PRESENTED TO
THE HERITAGE LODGE
MARCH 15TH, 1989**

Bro. Malcolm Montgomery
entitled:

**Winners and Losers: The Impact of the American
Revolution on Freemasons of the Mohawk Valley**

THE FIRST REVIEW - was prepared by R.W.Bro. Robert S. Throop, P.G.S.W., Past Master of Temple Lodge No. 665, Ottawa District 1; and the 9th Worshipful Master of the Heritage Lodge No. 730, Waterloo District.

Worshipful Master and Brethren:

W. Bro. Montgomery is to be congratulated on bringing to us a very interesting and detailed resume of some of the principal players in the drama that was un-folding in the Mohawk Valley in the latter part of the eighteenth century. A drama that was to have far reaching and profound effect on the history of the North American Continent both north and south of the border that was later to be established, and indeed on the entire world.

The extensive research that he must have carried out is evident in the scope of the References and Bibliographies appended to his paper.

History as recorded is not necessarily the result of that which is seen through unprejudiced eyes. I would take issue with the quote attributed to Professor Nelson that "The Loyalists in the American Revolution suffered a most abject kind of political failure, losing not only their argument, their war, and their place

in American society, but even their proper place in history", and with Bro. Montgomery's statement "there would seem to be little argument with Professor Nelson's conclusion..." It is undisputably true that the Loyalists were losers in the war and probably lost their place in American society. However, they established for themselves a place in history of far greater importance than that which they would have achieved had they not taken the stand that they did. As the Honourable Eugene Forsey so aptly points out in the Preface to *Loyal She Remains*, Ontario and indeed Canada owes its creation to the Loyalists. (1)

General James Robertson is reported to have said "I never had an idea of subduing the Americans. I meant to assist the good Americans subdue the bad".

W.Bro. Montgomery confines himself to the Freemasons of St. Patrick's Lodge No. 4 G.l.N.Y. in Johnstown. One wonders how the Freemasons of the other two lodges in the Mohawk Valley at that time were involved. These were Union of Albany, instituted in 1765 and St. George's of Schenectady, instituted in 1774. (2) The question, insofar as St. George's was concerned, is answered in the history of that lodge written in 1925 and reads in part as follows "We had one Tory and only one.....He was Robert Clench, a charter member and the only one who did not serve on the side of the Colonies." This brother eventually became the first secretary of St. John's Lodge of Friendship No. 2 of Niagara. (3)

It would seem that Sir William Johnson had a great amount of influence on who became a member of St. Patrick's. Had he not died on the eve of the Revolution it makes interesting specula-

tion on just what part he would have played.

W.Bro. Montgomery in reporting on the meeting of St. Patrick's Lodge held 5 May 1774 suggests that there was no indication that the Lodge would go into darkness until after the war. He mentions that they "even appointed a Tyler, after Br. Thomas Morgan had previously expressed his desire to hold that office." He does not tell us if Bro. Morgan was that Tyler. Bro. Morgan's zeal for Masonry sets us an example for he had just been initiated that evening. (4)

There are some minor discrepancies in W. Bro. Montgomery's paper which for the sake of historical accuracy should perhaps be verified.

The author states that Christopher Yates was initiated into St. Patrick's Lodge on 7 November 1767. E.G. Dougherty states that he was initiated on 1 August 1767. (5) Perhaps Yates may have been raised on 7 November 1767.

W. Bro. Montgomery states that the last colonial meeting of St. Patrick's lodge for which there are any records was held on Thursday 5 May, 1774, and further on he states that the last surviving colonial minutes were dated Thursday 4 May, 1774. It is probable that Thursday 5 May is correct rather than Thursday 4 May.

W. Montgomery mentions that Sir John Johnson was the only son of Sir William Johnson. Sir John Johnson was the only son of Sir William by Catherine Wisenberg. Sir William, however, had three sons by Mary (Molly) Brant, namely George, Peter and Brant. It is recorded in Loyalist Settlements 1783 - 1789 that a presenta-

tion of claim was made before Commissioner Jeremy Pemberton at Montreal on 2 July, 1787 on behalf of the children of Sir William Johnson and Mary Brant. (6) George and Peter are named in this claim. On 30 August, 1787 the claim of Brant Johnson was heard at Niagara. The minutes read "He is the son of Sir Wm. Johnson. Served all the war as Lieut. in Indian Dept.." A note is appended as follows "The lodged claim is not with us but claimant is heard on a Supposition that his claim may have been lodged by Major Leake or Sir John Johnson in England." (7)

There seems to be no record that any of these three sons were ever made Freemasons. Perhaps W.Bro. Montgomery may be able to advise us on this point.

In discussing the relationship with Golds-brow Banyar, there is an apparent misprint for the author states in the middle paragraph, in reference to Sir William Johnson, "as a friend and confident of the Six Native Indians..." I am certain that it was meant to read "of the Six Nations Indians..."

These are details, however, and scarcely detract from W. Bro. Montgomery's work.

The crucible of war has always brought out the strength and weakness of men. W. Bro. Montgomery's paper demonstrates that the brethren of St. Patrick's Lodge were no exception.

Sir John Johnson was in time of war the avowed enemy of some of his St. Patrick's Lodge brethren. They, on their part, forced him to abandon all of his property and fortune in the Mohawk valley. It is of interest to note that many years later he caused the Warrant and sterling silver jewels to be returned to their place in St. Patrick's lodge. This act amply demonstrated the lasting bonds of Freemasonry

and indeed the strength of character of this Loyalist Mason.

We have seen that there were winners and losers on both sides of this conflict. Robert S. Allen sums it up in much the same fashion as does W. Bro. Montgomery when he writes "In times of revolution or civil war - one man's loyalty becomes another's treason. The great irony of the American Revolution is that both the Loyalists and Patriots believed that they were fighting to preserve American liberty." (8)

W.Bro. Montgomery has given us a most interesting and informative insight into the lives of the brethren of the Mohawk Valley in a very historical time.

We are grateful to him.

REFERENCES

1. Eugene A. Forsey, Preface to Loyal She Remains, a pictorial history of Ontario, 1984. U.E.L. Association of Canada.
2. E.F. Dougherty, Loyalist Masons of the Mohawk Valley.
The papers of the Canadian Masonic Research Association,
The Heritage Lodge No. 730 G.R.C. 1986 Vol. II page 1252.
3. Ibid page 1259
4. Ibid page 1254
5. Ibid page 1254
6. W. Bruce Antliff, Loyalist Settlements, 1783-1789, Archives of Ontario, page 260
7. Ibid page 349.
8. Robert S. Allen, The Loyal Americans, 1983, National Museum of Canada.

Robert S, Throop.

REPLY TO REVIEW OF R.W.BRO. ROBERT S. THROOP

by

W. Bro. Malcolm Montgomery

I note with interest R.W. Brother Throop's review of my paper. Coincidentally, the name of Throop was well known in both pre-revolutionary and past-revolutionary New York. One George Throop made a claim for damages by "the enemy" (British) to his property in Tryon County.(1) The same George Throop obtained Land Bounty Rights for his military services after the Revolution(2) Another, Major Josiah Throop served in the Tryon County Militia under Col. Marinus Willett.(3) Yet another native of Johnstown, Enos Thompson Throop 1784-1834 was Governor of New York State 1831-1833. I also note that one Daniel Throop is listed on the Old U.E. List and settled in Augusta District of Upper Canada in 1794. Considering that my reviewer R.W.Bro. Robert Throop is possibly a descendant of one of those branches of the Throop family, I take comfort in the fact that my paper was kind to both sides.

The reason that I confined my study to the member so St. Patrick's Lodge was because of the fact that the Lodge has an almost complete set of Colonial Minutes and as well, it had about forty-five members. Even that was more than I felt I could deal with in this paper. Further, many members were men of great historical significance.

On the outset I am glad that my reviewer noted the typographical error in the date of the last recorded colonial meeting of St. Patrick's Lodge and I thank him for spotting that this meeting should read 5 May 1774 which is

this meeting should read 5 May 1774 which is correct. Also Six "Natives" should read Six "Nations".

I note that R.W. Bro. Throop mentions Thomas Morgan who was appointed Tyler on 5 May 1774. The reviewer was perhaps mislead by my reference to Thomas Morgan as "Brother". Further, it would appear that he relied on Bro. Dougherty's paper for initiation dates. A close review of the original minutes reveals that Thomas Morgan was made Tyler "to the Entered Apprentice and Fellow Crafts Lodges." I myself was mislead by the description of Morgan in the final Colonial Minutes as "Brother". The Minutes do not reflect his being in St. Patrick's Lodge as either a visitor or member prior to that time and there is no further explanation anywhere in the Minutes. There is no record of Morgan having been initiated in St. Patrick's. His description as "Brother" does raise unanswered questions as to a possible initiation elsewhere. Perhaps he was a member of Union Lodge in Albany but that Lodge's Colonial Minutes are not complete. Thomas Morgan was a taylor at Johnstown(4) and it would appear that he took no part in the Revolution.

My date for the initiation of Christopher Yates on 7 November 1767 is correct and this is confirmed in the Lodge Minutes. L. G. Dougherty was mistaken in suggesting that Christopher Yates was initiated 1 August 1767. On that latter date, Christopher Yates was balloted upon. The Minutes of that date reveal "The Petition of Christopher Yates being presented to the Lodge and read praying to be admitted into this Ancient and Honourable Society as an Entered Apprentice was Balloted and approved of."

Insofar as the sons of Sir William Johnson

are concerned, Sir John Johnson was considered to be the only possible legitimate son of Sir William. Sir John was considered to be legitimate by the Court of St. James, otherwise, he would not have been Knighted in 1765. However, there is no proof whatsoever that Sir William Johnson was ever married to Catherine Weisenberg and he was not reflected as the father in the baptismal records from Fort Hunter when his son John and two daughters were baptized and in those records only their mother's maiden name was recorded. The "Register Book" kept by Rev. Henry Barclay at the Indian Chapel at Fort Hunter records the following baptisms:

"June 8th, 1740: Ann, daughter of Catherine Weisenberg."

"February 7th, 1742: John, son of Catherine Wysen Bergh"(sic)

"October 14th, 1744: Mary, daughter of Catherine Wysenberk"(sic 5)

Nowhere was the father mentioned nor is there any existing proof that Sir William was ever married. In any event, Sir William described them as legitimate in his will and in his correspondence he never denied their legitimacy and the matter need not concern us further. His Indian offspring were numerous and there is no record of any of them having been Freemasons. Also, there were no Indian members of St. Patrick's Lodge.

R.W. Brother Throop erred in thinking that Robert Clench of St. George's Lodge in Schenectady was first secretary of "St. John's Lodge of Friendship No. 2" Niagara. Bro. Dougherty in his paper says that Ralph Clench was the settler in Niagara and Secretary of "Friendship" Lodge. Ralph Clench was the son of Robert Clench of St. George's Lodge and this is con-

firmed both in Dougherty's quotation and in the Sesquicentennial History of St. George's Lodge. (6) Biographical details of Ralph Clench of Niagara is to be found in D.C.B. Vol.VI PP.153-154 in an article written by Bruce G. Wilson. R.W. Bro. John Ross Robertson wrote that Ralph Clench was Secretary of "St. John's Lodge No.19" which was warranted by The Provincial Grand Lodge of Quebec and that its first public mention was in the Upper Canada Gazette on 14 July 1794 when "Ralph Clench" as Secretary had inserted a notice calling a meeting. Robertson notes that a warrant was granted on the Petition of Lt. Col. Butler on 10 October 1787. It was only later that St. John's Lodge No. 19 amalgamated with Lodge No. 2 of Niagara sometime between 1794-1796 with Ralph Clench as Secretary. (7)

Much gratitude is due to Bro. Dougherty for his seminal article which excited us to make further exploration of the topic which is an area of fascinating research. In closing, I would like to thank R.W. Bro. Bob Throop for his excellent detailed review of my paper.

REFERENCES

1. Office of The State Comptroller, New York In the Revolution, Albany, 1904, Vol.II P.182.
2. Ibid., P. 216.
3. Ibid., Vol. I P.87.
4. Johnson Papers, Vol. VIII, P.1058.
5. John Thomas Flexner, Mohawk Baronet, P.26.
6. Schenectady, Sept. 1924, P.63.
7. John Ross Robertson, History of Freemasonry in Canada Toronto, 1900, Vol. I, PP.275-277.

Malcolm Montgomery

MASONIC REGULARITY - THE ENGLISH POINT OF VIEW*

by

W.Bro. J. M. Hamill PJGD,

Librarian and Curator, United Grand
Lodge of England

The United Grand Lodge of England's attitude to Masonic regularity is clearly set forth in its Basic Principles for Grand Lodge Recognition (Appendix A). This statement was formally adopted by the United Grand Lodge of England (UGL of E) at its meeting on 4 September 1929. It might seem odd that a Grand Lodge which had existed for over two hundred years should not have published such an important document earlier in its history but English Masonic jurisprudence has been rather like the English legal system - a mixture of 'statute law' (the Book of Constitutions and edicts of Grand Lodge) and 'common law' (basic Masonic principles and customs).

The reason why the Basic Principles were codified and published in 1929 is easy to answer. In the aftermath of the First World War, Europe was in disarray. The Imperial Monarchies of Russia, Germany and Austria-Hungary had been swept away. Frontiers were redrawn and new nation states were created or freed in the Baltic and Balkan areas. In the 1920's many groups sprang up in Europe calling themselves Masonic

* Paper presented at the Regular Meeting of The Heritage Lodge held in the Masonic Building, Windsor, Ontario, Saturday, May 13, 1989.

and applied to the UGL of E for recognition. Up to that point applications for recognition had not appeared with great regularity and each case had been dealt with using the principles of English Masonic Constitutional and common law. In addition to these new bodies attempts were being made to set up various international Masonic bodies (eg the Universal League of Freemasons) and international conferences, at both of which groups bodies considered irregular by the UGL of E might be invited to attend.

As a result the then M.W. The Grand Master, HRH the Duke of Connaught, requested the Board of General Purposes, the UGL of E's policy making body, to codify the various principles of regularity, which had been in use for generations, so that the code could be formally adopted by Grand Lodge and published so that the Masonic world in general would become aware of what the Mother Grand Lodge regarded as the basic principles necessary in any body seeking to be recognised as a regular Grand Lodge. Publication also had two other functions. It laid down for aspiring Grand Lodges what would be required of them if they sought recognition and it emphasized to the non-Masonic world that not all bodies claiming to be Masonic were necessarily recognised within the Masonic world as being worthy of recognition as regular Masonic authorities.

The earliest official statement on regularity appears in Rule 8 of Anderson's Constitutions of 1723. This states: ".....if any Set or Number of Masons shall take upon themselves to form a Lodge without the Grand Master's Warrant, the regular lodges are not to countenance them....". At that stage the concept of regularity only applied to lodges and in simple terms meant that a lodge was only regular if it

met with the permission of the Grand Master. Surprisingly, when the Grand Lodges of Ireland (1725), Scotland (1736) and All England (1762, commonly known as the York Grand Lodge) arose they were simply accepted as sister Grand Lodges without any formal process of recognition being gone through. The lodges which formed them had existed "time immemorial" and functioned in the same manner as the lodges in England.

Such was not the case with the rival Antients Grand Lodge when it was formed, initially as a Grand Committee, in 1751. Its founders were predominantly Irish Brethren in London who had been refused admission into English lodges and therefore proceeded to form their own lodges and a Grand Lodge. The reaction of the premier Grand Lodge was immediate - it branded the Antient's Grand Lodge, its Lodges and members as irregular and clandestine and threatened its own lodges and members with expulsion if they countenanced any members of the new Grand Lodge. Despite this fact the Antients prospered both at home and abroad and in return regarded the members of the premier Grand Lodge as irregular.

The premier Grand Lodge had begun to export Freemasonry abroad in 1729 and by the 1740s had lodges in Europe, North America, the West Indies and India. To superintend these lodges successive Grand Masters appointed Provincial Grand Masters to act as their Deputies in specified areas. They were given very wide powers and because of the problems of communication with London began to act virtually as independent Grand Masters. A problem arose in Holland in the 1750s when the English lodges decided to break from their mother Grand Lodge and proclaimed themselves an independent Grand Lodge.

The quarrel dragged on for twenty years until an accord was reached resulting in a formal treaty in which the premier Grand Lodge recognised the Grand East of the Netherlands and set an important precedent by recognising the new the new Grand Lodge's territorial sovereignty within the borders of Holland. Similar steps were taken with the Grand Lodge which evolved in Prussia in the 1770s. Up until this point both Grand Lodges in England had regarded the world as free territory for establishing new lodges. The precedent set in the Dutch treaty has been followed ever since by England: once a sovereign Grand Lodge has been recognised England regards the area covered by that Grand Lodge as closed territory.

A rather curious situation arose as a result of the American colonies winning their independence from the Crown. In all of the thirteen colonies lodges had been established by the Grand Lodges of England, Ireland and Scotland. Once political independence had been won the lodges in each of the States formed their own Grand Lodges without reference to the home Grand Lodges. No formal applications for recognition were received and the new Grand Lodges appear to have simply been accepted as existing. There was, in fact, little that the home Grand Lodges could have objected to. The lodges which formed the new Grand Lodges had all been regularly formed, continued to follow the same principles upon which they had been founded and had formed themselves into Grand Lodges in the same manner as the lodges in England, Ireland and Scotland had done.

The 19th century saw a growth in the number of Grand Lodges in Europe, North and South America. Not unnaturally these new Grand Lodges sought recognition from England and a three

tier system of dealing with such requests was developed. At the top was full recognition with an exchange of representatives, the representative at the Grand Lodge of England being given a Grand Rank and the right to vote in the UGL of E. In the middle was what was termed "fraternal correspondence", a sort of half-way house in which matters were dealt with by correspondence between the respective Grand Secretaries, recognition was accorded, allowing intervisitation, but representatives were not exchanged. And finally, there was refusal of recognition. Quite why a two tier system of recognition was used and on what basis Grand Lodges were selected for full exchange of representatives or limited to fraternal correspondence has not yet been discovered.

A new set of problems arose in the mid-19th century when lodges in Canada and Australia began to look for independence. That the lodges were regular was beyond doubt. The major questions were whether those who were promoting the idea of a local Grand Lodge had the full support of the lodges and had the ability to guide the new Grand Lodge through its early years, and to avoid any schism within the new body. The movement began here in Ontario but today is not the time to go through the horrendous quarrels and misunderstandings between the lodges and Grand Lodge. The transfer of power in the Canadian Provinces went fairly smoothly, for the good reason that there was almost total support for independence. As a result the new Grand Lodges were immediately recognised.

Such cannot be said about Australia. When the first stirrings of masonic independence began it was clear that those seeking independence did not have the full support of the lodges in their area. In New South Wales and Victoria a

number of lodges grouped together to form State Grand Lodges and were more than somewhat dismayed when the home Grand Lodges refused to recognise them, suspended the lodges concerned and declared any work they performed clandestine. The situation became very tense and required a great deal of tact and diplomacy to defuse and rectify. The home Grand Lodges consulted together and arrived at a system which has been used ever since to transfer power to a new Grand Lodge formed from lodges owing allegiance to the home Grand Lodges. The first step was to hold a referendum in all the lodges in the area. If the majority within a lodge were in favour of joining the proposed Grand Lodge then the vote of that lodge was for the new body. If a majority of the lodge votes were for the new Grand Lodge then the formation would be agreed to and almost immediate recognition given. Once that was done the home Grand Lodges agreed to regard the area covered by the new Grand Lodge as a closed area and would not issue warrants for new lodges within it. In return the new Grand Lodge had to guarantee the independence and not interfere in the working of those lodges within its area which chose to remain under the home Grand Lodges. The system proved not only to be equable but also workable, ensured the regular transfer of authority and resulted in very cordial relations between the home and Commonwealth Grand Lodges.

Having given some of the historical background now is perhaps the time to comment upon the actual Basic Principles.

1. Regularity of Origin: it is axiomatic that the body seeking recognition should be regular in origin. This regularity can be established in one of two ways: by its founding lodges having been constituted by one or more regular

Grand Lodges; or by a regular Grand Lodge deliberately setting up lodges in an area for the purposes of founding a Grand Lodge. Good examples of the former are the Commonwealth Grand Lodges, and the latter the National Grand Lodge of France which was set up by the UGL of E in 1912 to provide for regular Freemasonry in France, where two irregular bodies existed, the second of which could not be recognized as its lodges originated not in the Craft but had been set up by an irregular Supreme Council in the Scottish Rite.

2. Belief in TGAOTU: that candidates express a belief in a Supreme Being is fundamental. Indeed the only Landmark defined by the UGL of E (Rule 125 (b) of the Book of Constitutions) is a belief in TGAOTU, on which there can be no compromise. When in 1875 the Grand Orient of France dropped belief in a Supreme Being as an essential qualification in candidates and removed all reference to TGAOTU from its Constitutions and rituals recognition was immediately withdrawn by the UGL of E. As a result inter-visitation ceased and the Grand Orient was declared irregular.

3. Obligations on the VSL: again it is axiomatic that to be an obligation proper the VSL of the particular religion of the candidate must be involved. Without it the obligation becomes but a serious promise which the candidate could at a later date repudiate.

4. A Male exclusive: historically Freemasonry has been a male preserve and continues to be so today. This is not because females are regarded as second-class but because our operative forbears were men and in the period when Freemasonry was formed and developed, women, regrettably, were second-class citizens. The

practical, but not insurmountable, problems of preparing candidates for the three degrees aside, male exclusivity avoids another problem. Differences of personality between men can cause problems enough in a group, add a difference of sex and you greatly multiply the problems. Additionally, many wives have no objection to their husbands going to an all male lodge, their attitude might be different if he was going to a mixed lodge! The ban extends to Masons as Masons being involved in groups calling themselves Masonic which include women. The question might properly be asked what about the Order of the Eastern Star and the various children's Orders in North America? The answer is simple: they are not Masonic Orders. The UGL of E, however, has never recognised them and will not allow its members to be involved in them in a Masonic capacity, believing that a Mason can only act in a Masonic capacity within the confines of Freemasonry. I emphasise act in a Masonic capacity so as not to give the impression that the UGL of E believes that brethren can only practice Masonic principles when acting in a Masonic context.

5. Sovereign Jurisdiction: in simple terms this means that the Grand Lodge must be a sovereign, autonomous, self-governing body owing allegiance to no other body; having sovereign jurisdiction over the lodges under its control; and being the only and undisputed authority over the Craft degrees within its jurisdiction. To me there is an obvious distinction between Sovereign Jurisdiction and the American principle of Territorial Exclusivity. To my mind Territorial Exclusivity means the Grand Lodge having sovereign rights over the territory it encompasses. For obvious historical reasons the UGL of E could never accept the principle of Territorial Exclusivity. Two examples will

suffice to demonstrate why. Because of the way Freemasonry was spread by the home Grand Lodges during the development of the British Empire there now exist four Masonic constitutions in South Africa - Districts under the Grand Lodges of England, Ireland and Scotland and a Grand Lodge of South Africa formed exclusively from the former Dutch lodges in South Africa. Because no English, Irish or Scottish Lodges opted to join the new Grand Lodge, formed in 1961, which is largely Afrikaans speaking, the home Grand Lodges continue to exercise their right to form new lodges within their South African Districts. In New Zealand four constitutions also exist. When the Grand Lodge of New Zealand was formed in 1890 a sizeable minority of English Lodges and a number of Irish and Scottish Lodges chose not to join the new Grand Lodge and continue to meet as lodges owing allegiance to the home Grand Lodges. As the majority of lodges had joined the new Grand Lodge, the home Grand Lodges agreed not to form new lodges in New Zealand. In simple terms they accepted the sovereign jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge of New Zealand but do not accept that it has exclusive jurisdiction in New Zealand and as long as lodges exist which wish to retain their allegiance to the home Grand Lodges. Whilst in practice in dealing with non-commonwealth (or former colonial territories) the UGL of E has usually recognised only one Grand Lodge per State or Country it has always preserved the right to recognize more than one Grand Lodge where all the basic principles have been fulfilled and where the Grand Lodges concerned have equal historical validity, eg. in Columbia where the Grand Lodges at Baranquilla, Bogota and Cartagena are all recognised.

6. Presence of the three Great Lights: the three great lights (the VSL, square and compas-

ses) are the physical embodiment of the three great principles of Masonry. Their presence and proper use in our assemblies are what differentiate our assemblies from any others. The most important is the VSL, the absence of which cannot be tolerated, as the Grand Orient of France and Belgium found to their cost. In English lodges the VSL is the Bible and even when non-Christian candidates take their obligations on the volume held sacred by their particular religion the Bible must still remain open with the square and compasses resting upon it.

7. No discussion of religion or politics: I would argue that the ban on the discussion of politics and religion is one of the landmarks of Freemasonry. Certainly the ban has existed since Freemasonry became formally organised. Brotherly Love is one of the basic principles of Freemasonry. In modern terms Brotherly Love can be expressed as tolerance. If politics and religion, the two most divisive subjects in human relations, were allowed to be discussed intolerance would soon rear its ugly head. Indeed there are a number of Masonic scholars today who argue that the desire for an organisation in which differences of opinion on matters of religion and politics could not obtrude was the impulse which brought Freemasonry into being. The period in which Freemasonry was developing, the late 16th and 17th centuries was one in which religion and politics were inextricably linked and differences of opinion on politics and religion split families and led to bloody civil war. They argue that Freemasonry was invented to enable men of differing views to meet together in peace and harmony to work for the betterment of mankind and to promote toleration in an immensely intolerant world.

8. Landmarks, customs and usages: although there is a great diversity of practice between the regular Grand Lodges there is a commonality between them usually characterised as the Landmarks, ancient customs and established usages of the Craft. Many Grand Lodges have issued lengthy lists of what they regard the landmarks to be. To English Masonic minds many of these landmarks would be more properly characterised as edicts of the Grand Lodge concerned or basic rules of administration for Grand Lodges and their subordinate lodges. The Grand Lodge of England, with the exception of the belief in a Supreme Being, has, perhaps wisely, never defined what it regards the Landmarks to be. The late Brother Henry Carr gave what is probably the most workable definition of a landmark: he described a landmark as being "time immemorial custom which if it were removed would materially alter the nature of Freemasonry". Using that definition I would suggest that the basic landmarks are: a belief in the Supreme Being; the presence of the VSL; the three great principles, Brotherly Love, Relief and Truth; the ban on the discussion of politics and religion; the use of ritual and symbolism; the communicating of modes of recognition; the taking of an obligation on the VSL; Freemasonry being a men only society. "Customs and Usages" includes the sovereignty of Grand Lodges; the subordination of private lodges to a Grand Lodge; the division of the Craft into three degrees; the wearing of regalia etc.

It cannot be overemphasised that a Grand Lodge seeking recognition from the UGL of E as a regular Masonic body must satisfy all eight of the Basic Principles, it cannot be accepted as regular if it cannot comply with them all. The Grande Loge de France is to all appearances a regular Grand Lodge but it could not comply

with the 1st and 5th Principles. The lodges which formed it were not warranted by a regular Grand Lodge but by an un-recognised Supreme Council, nor in its early years was it a Sovereign body as for many years it was subservient to the Supreme Council which formed it. A number of bodies in Spain and Portugal claiming to be Masonic in the 19th century could not be recognised because they did not comply with what is now the 7th Principle - the ban on political and religious discussion. Indeed in some cases they were anti-clerical political parties masquerading as Freemasonry because political parties and meetings were banned.

In the next few years sovereignty may become a major issue. In 1992 the European Community intends introducing legislation to bring a United States of Europe a step nearer. The Swiss Grand Lodge Alpina has already suggested that consideration should be given to the formation of a United Grand Lodge of Europe or a Federation of European Grand Lodges. The UGL of E has declined to consider the proposal. To join in a UGL of Europe or a European Federation would require the present regular European Grand Lodges to surrender all or part of their sovereignty. This would be in contravention of the 5th Basic Principle.

The UGL of E is sometimes taken to task for its rigid stance on regularity and for taking its time in according recognition to new Grand Lodges. The answers to both charges are simple. As the Mother Grand Lodge the UGL of E believes it should set an example to others to protect Freemasonry from straying from the path it has always followed. In dealing with applications for recognition it would rather take time to investigate and ensure that it is regular than grant speedy recognition and have to withdraw it.

In a world in part of which Freemasonry is under attack and in which the privileges of Freemasonry have been abused by its own members it is important that regularity be maintained and our principles be safeguarded. It is equally important that bodies which do not meet standards of regularity should not be accorded recognition, so that the popular and uninstructed world can see that Freemasons do not just mouth their beliefs but actually follow them.

Appendix A

BASIC PRINCIPLES FOR GRAND LODGE RECOGNITION

Accepted by the Grand Lodge September 4, 1929

The M.W. The Grand Master having expressed a desire that the Board would draw up a statement of the Basic Principles on which this Grand Lodge could be invited to recognise any Grand Lodge applying for recognition by the English Jurisdiction, the Board of General Purposes had gladly complied.

The result, as follows, has been approved by the Grand Master and it will form the basis of a questionnaire to be forwarded in future to each Jurisdiction requesting English recognition. The Board desires that not only such bodies but the Brethren generally throughout the Grand Master's Jurisdiction shall be fully informed as to those Basic Principles of Freemasonry for which the Grand Lodge of England has stood throughout its history.

1. Regularity of origin; i.e. each Grand Lodge shall have been established lawfully by a duly recognised Grand Lodge or by three or more regularly constituted Lodges.
2. That a belief in the G.A.O.T.U. and 'His revealed will' shall be an essential qualification for membership.
3. That all Initiates shall take their Obligation on or in full view of the open Volume of the Sacred Law, by which is meant the revelation from above which is binding on the conscience of the particular individual who is being initiated.

4. That the membership of the Grand Lodge and individual Lodges shall be composed exclusively of men; and that each Grand Lodge shall have no Masonic intercourse of any kind with mixed Lodges or bodies which admit women to membership.

5. That the Grand Lodge shall have sovereign jurisdiction over the Lodges under its control; i.e. that it shall be a responsible, independent, self-governing organisation, with sole and undisputed authority over the Craft or Symbolic Degrees (Entered Apprentice, Fellow Craft, and Master Mason) within its Jurisdiction; and shall not in any way be subject to, or divide such authority with, a Supreme Council or other Power claiming any control or supervision over those degrees.

6. That the three Great Lights of Freemasonry (namely, the Volume of the Sacred Law, the Square and the Compasses) shall always be exhibited when the Grand Lodge or its subordinate Lodges are at work, the chief of these being the Volume of the Sacred Law.

7. That the discussion of religion and politics within the Lodge shall be strictly prohibited.

8. That the principles of the Antient Landmarks, customs and usages of the Craft shall be strictly observed.

OUR DEPARTED BRETHREN

The following names of deceased members of The Heritage Lodge No. 730, G.R.C., have come to our attention during the past year. Several specific dates of passing were not known.

R.W. Bro. William G. Bodley

Etobicoke

Connaught Lodge No. 501

Died December 4, 1988

R.W. Bro. Gwilyn Ivor Davies

Burlington

Wellington Square Lodge No. 725

Died January 5, 1989

V.W. Bro. Harry Donin

Downsview

Palestine Lodge No. 559

Died November 11, 1988

Bro. Frank G. Dyer

Toronto

Ulster Lodge No. 537

Died August 20, 1988

W. Bro. Robert Collin Fraser

Burlington

Beach Lodge No. 639

Died, 1989

R.W. Bro. Alexander Grant

Mississauga

Joseph A. Hearn Lodge No. 685

Died October 14, 1988

W. Bro. Hugh Gordon Hargrave
Willowdale
Caledonia Lodge No. 637
Died March 16, 1988

V.W. Bro. Percy Herman Lipsett
Willowdale
Palestine Lodge No. 559
Died January 16, 1989

Bro. William Albert Martin
Willowdale
Kroy Lodge No. 676
Died September 25, 1988

Bro. Charles Reich
Downsview
Palestine Lodge No. 559
Died November, 1988

V.W. Bro. Robert George Rickward
Richmond Hill
Robertson Lodge No. 292
Died November 23, 1988

R.W. Bro. Robert Robson
St. Catharines
Barns O' Clyde Lodge No. 1018, G.R.S.
Died March 28, 1989

V.W. Bro. William Earl Truscott
Windsor
Great Western Lodge No. 47
Died January, 1989

THE HILL

"Tis easy to walk all the way down the hill
When we feel the wind in our back,
But it takes a good man to climb up that hill
With his clothes in an old gunny sack.

"Tis easy to envy another man's lot
When it seems not as hard as our own,
He may be a man who cannot make friends,
And bears all his burdens alone.

We wait the magic of Springtime
When the sun shines all the day long,
Grand children, pups, and kittens,
Will play the whole day on the lawn.

But life's not all joy and gladness,
We will all have our own troubled time,
We will all have a share of heartache,
When the sun refuses to shine.

But next morn, as we go to the window,
The sun's rays have already shown through,
Gives us faith, we will walk in the garden,
Mid the birds, in that first morning dew.

Our Creator made all of us different,
We were never put here to stand still,
Let us hold our torch high, each one in his turn,
Will be ready to climb the hill.

Gordon Winters
March 21, 1989

W. Bro. Winters is a P.M. of Scott Lodge No.
421, G.R.C., Grand Valley, Ontario.

GRAND LODGE OFFICERS (1988-1989)

THE MOST WORSHIPFUL THE GRAND MASTER

M.W. Bro. William R. Pellow
240 Wharncliffe Rd.N., Suite 300,
London, Ont., N6H 4P2

THE DEPUTY GRAND MASTER

R.W. Bro. David C. Bradley
81 Hillside Ave. W.,
Toronto, Ont., M5P 1G2

THE GRAND SECRETARY

M.W. Bro. Robert E. Davies
P.O. Box 217
Hamilton, Ont., L8N 3C9

THE HERITAGE LODGE OFFICERS (1988-1989)

Worshipful Master,	R.W. Bro. Edmund V. Ralph
I. Past Master,	R.W. Bro. Edsel C. Steen
Senior Warden,	V.W. Bro. Donald Kaufman
Junior Warden,	R.W. Bro. W.T. Greenhough
Chaplain,	R.W. Bro. R. Cerwyn Davies
Treasurer,	R.W. Bro. D.J. McFadgen
Secretary,	R.W. Bro. Rev. W.G. Rivers
Ass't Secretary,	W. Bro. George F. Moore
Senior Deacon,	R.W. Bro. Frank G. Dunn
Junior Deacon,	W. Bro. Stephen Maizels
Dir. Ceremonies,	W. Bro. Albert A. Barker
Inner Guard,	W. Bro. David Fletcher
Senior Steward,	R.W. Bro. Kenneth Whiting
Junior Steward,	W. Bro. Thomas Crowley
Organist,	R.W. Bro. Leonard Hertel
Historian,	R.W. Bro. Fred Branscombe
Tyler,	R.W. Bro. Larry J. Hostine

CHAIRMEN, LODGE COMMITTEES (1988-1989)

Archivist,	W. Bro. Glenson T. Jones
Editor,	R.W. Bro. Jacob (Jack) Pos
Masonic Info.	R.W. Bro. C. Edwin Drew
Curator,	W. Bro. Harold Smith
Librarian,	R.W. Bro. John Storey
Graphics,	Bro. Basil Liaskas
Finance & B-Laws,	W. Bro. Donald Thornton
Membership,	R.W. Bro. John M. Boersma
Blk. Cr. Heritage	V.W. Bro. Allan D. Hogg
Central Data Bank	W. Bro. James M. Major
Publications,	R.W. Bro. Balfour LeGresley
Special Events,	R.W. Bro. Kenneth Whiting
Liaskas Paintings	R.W. Bro. Frank G. Dunn
Auditors:	R.W. Bro. Kenneth Bartlett
	R.W. Bro. James Curtis

The Heritage Corporation:

President,	Jack Pos
Vice President,	Allan Hogg
Secretary,	Donald Kaufman

PAST MASTERS

1977 (U.D.)	R.W. Bro. Jacob (Jack) Pos
1978	R.W. Bro. Jacob (Jack) Pos
1979	R.W. Bro. Keith R. Flynn
1980	R.W. Bro. Donald Grinton
1981	M.W. Bro. Ronald E. Groshaw
1982	V.W. Bro. George E. Zwicker
1983	R.W. Bro. Balfour LeGresley
1984	R.W. Bro. David C. Bradley
1985	R.W. Bro. C. Edwin Drew
1986	R.W. Bro. Robert S. Throop
1987	W. Bro. Albert A. Barker
1988	R.W. Bro. Edsel C. Steen

